

THE  
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.<sup>10901</sup>

VOL. I.

JAN.—OCT., 1869.

---

Πάντα δοκιμάζετε· τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.—1 THESS. V, 21.

---

EDITOR.

W. T. MOORE,

PASTOR OF CHURCH OF CHRIST, WALNUT-STREET, CINCINNATI.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

W. K. PENDLETON,

*President of Bethany College, West Virginia.*

ISAAC ERRETT,

*President of Alliance College, Ohio.*

ROBERT GRAHAM,

*Presid't of College of Arts in Kentucky Univ'y.*

DR. S. E. SHEPARD,

*Of Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio.*

THOMAS MUNNELL,

*Cor. Sec'y of Amer. Chris. Missionary Society.*

ALEXANDER PROCTER,

*Pastor of Church of Christ, Independence, Mo.*

---

CINCINNATI:

R. W. CARROLL & CO., PUBLISHERS,

115 AND 117 WEST FOURTH-STREET.

1869.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1869,

BY R. W. CARROLL & CO.,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.







THE  
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

---

JANUARY, 1869.

---

I.—MODERN PREACHERS AND PREACHING.

*Gleanings Among the Sheaves.* By REV. C. H. SPURGEON. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1869.

*The Gospel Preacher: A Book of Twenty Sermons.* By BENJAMIN FRANKLIN. Cincinnati: Franklin & Rice, Publishers. 1869.

*Nature and Life.* Sermons by ROBERT COLLYER. Boston: Horace B. Fuller. 1867.

*Thoughts on Personal Religion; Being a Treatise on the Christian Life in its Two Chief Elements—Devotion and Practice.* Fourth American Edition, enlarged. By REV. EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1869.

*Sermons* by HENRY WARD BEECHER. Selected from Published and Unpublished Discourses. In Two Volumes. Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1868.

IF Dominie Sampson had lived in our days he might have "wagged his pow in a pulpit" after all. There are now so many guides to the Divinity student, so many helps to aid "stickit ministers" over the theological fence, that it is difficult to conceive how any one can fail to get on cleverly as a preacher of the Gospel, though he should have scarcely a qualification for his work.

This is decidedly a manufacturing age. And why not manufacture ministers of the Gospel as well as any thing else? There is certainly as much demand for them as for any other article of either home or foreign consumption. The harvest is truly great, and the laborers are few. Hence, if the thing can be done, that is, if ministers *can be made to order*, to supply the pressing need of the age,

we do not see any reason why we should hesitate for a moment in giving aid and comfort to any manufacturing establishment that will give good promise of success in this business.

But it may be a question whether the thing can be done: "*ab initio*;" and this is the first question that must be settled in order to come to any just conclusion in reference to ministerial education. And we do not raise this question because we suppose any one who has seriously reflected upon the subject, and who is sufficiently informed to understand the subject, will conclude that an efficient ministry is a thing that can be manufactured to order; but in this utilitarian age, when machinery is used for almost every thing, when the rattle of wheels is the index of power, and the dimensions of a library the measure of mental aptitude, it becomes us to be careful, lest we contaminate the most sacred of all callings with the spirit of mechanism, which, in a large sense, is the ruling spirit of the age.

During the first half of the present century, the question as to what constitutes a Divine call to the ministry was very fully and ably discussed, both in this country and Europe. The beginning of the nineteenth century was the turning point, in religious thought, from a semi-mysticism to more rational and consistent views of the Bible. The danger now is that we may go too far; may reach the opposite extreme of mysticism—rationalism or materialism. And in the present very earnest and commendable effort to provide the Churches with an educated ministry, this is the point to be guarded. We must not lose sight of the fact that every true minister of the Gospel must have some special qualifications for his work, which none of the colleges in the land can confer upon him. Let us, then, inquire what these qualifications are.

1. He must have a reasonable amount of native intellectual force. We know that it is a favorite idea with some that all men are equal in *natural* intellectual endowments, and that the difference in men is accounted for by the difference in their education. But this view of the matter is not seriously entertained by any considerable portion of thinking people; for it would be just as reasonable to say that the difference in physical development is dependent upon the difference in the food eaten during the period of growth. But every one knows that this is not true, for children who eat the same kind of food have often very different physical developments. Hence, we

insist upon it that there is a very great difference in the *natural* mental endowments of men, and that a man who enters upon the work of the ministry should give evidence that he has some natural qualifications for his work. We wish to emphasize the word *natural*, for some have supposed that there is a war between nature and the Gospel, and that a man, to be a successful minister of the Gospel, must have his nature so changed that he will be *unnatural* in all that he says and does. This, we think, is a great mistake. The Gospel does not make war upon nature. It is a perversion of nature that the Gospel finds fault with, and seeks to remedy. And, all other things being equal, the man who is most natural in his manner of preaching the Gospel will always be most successful. The day of supernatural endowments, in the miraculous sense, is past. We do not say, however, that the preacher does not receive Divine assistance; on the contrary, we affirm that the faithful minister does receive such assistance, and without this would essentially fail; but what we mean is, that this assistance is not such as to endow him with special gifts, such as the proclaimers of the Gospel had during the Apostolic ministry. Hence, we conclude that the minister of the Gospel who would be successful in winning souls to Christ must have some natural qualifications for his work—must give evidence that he possesses the intellectual and physical endowments necessary to give him power before the people.

2. He must have the highest moral qualifications. We care not what may be his mental and physical capabilities, he can not do the work of God without moral fitness. True, a man who is wholly destitute of moral character may, for a while, by superior tact and intellectual force, keep himself before the people, as a minister of the Gospel, and meet with a certain degree of success. It does not follow that the Gospel is not "the power of God unto salvation," because the man who proclaims it is destitute of a moral character. Men may preach the Gospel through very unworthy motives; but if the Gospel is preached, no matter who proclaims it, it is the good seed of the Kingdom, and will bring forth, more or less, good fruit. But the work of the faithful minister is only partially complete when he has announced "the glad tidings of great joy" to the people. Those converted must now be gathered into a Church, properly organized, and instructed in the Divine life. And just here is where

the unworthy minister will fail—signally fail—for he must “show himself a pattern in all things;” and if he be destitute of moral rectitude, if his work in the ministry is prompted by sinister motives, his hypocrisy will become manifest, sooner or later, whenever he begins to work out the problem of Church organization and spiritual growth. Hence, in order to any permanent success, the minister of the Gospel must have the highest moral fitness for his work. But this is by no means the only thing necessary. As a righteous life is such an essential matter, it has too frequently been made the only necessary qualification. And hence, men have frequently been selected and urged to enter the ministry who had not a single qualification except that they were good men; that is, they were good in the sense that they did not do any thing *positively wrong*, and yet it would be difficult to find wherein they ever did any thing *positively good*. Such men are simply *negative* men, and can never be effective agents in carrying the Gospel, through the struggle and conflict which they must necessarily meet, to a lost and ruined world. In a certain sense, men may be so good as to be *good for nothing*, but this is not the character who will become a living impersonification of the great aggressive power which is to work out the world’s redemption from sin. Nothing short of a character full of *positive* elements can be reasonably successful in the propagation of the Gospel. Hence, it is the weakness and shame of the ministry of the present day that it is largely composed of men whose qualifications are confined to a single element, rather than to the many that enter into ministerial character. We forget that while goodness is essential to the character of a true minister, it does not follow, because a man has goodness, that, therefore, he is qualified for the work of the ministry. We should be careful not to single out one attribute and give it an undue prominence, when there are others of equal importance that should be considered in determining ministerial qualifications. By properly discriminating at this point, we may, in the future, avoid the reproach which has so long rested upon the ministry; namely, when a man is found to be unfit for any thing else, *it is supposed to be good evidence that he is called to preach the Gospel*. This will never do. God wants the best sacrifices, “the firstlings of the flock,” and hence, the very best talent in all the land should be consecrated to the ministry of the Word.

3. No young man should enter upon the work of the ministry who does not feel compelled to do so by an irresistible conviction of duty. He should feel as Paul did: "Woe be to me if I preach not the Gospel." A young man approached an old preacher once and said to him, "I have been thinking of giving myself to the work of the ministry; would you advise me to do it?" The old man answered, "*Not if you can help it.*" This cracks the shell and exposes the kernel of the whole matter. If a young man can keep from entering the ministry, he had better not enter. We mean by this that if he can keep from it without violating his most decided and earnest convictions of duty, he had better not begin a work in which he is almost sure to fail. And when we use the word fail, we do not mean that he will not be able to do any thing, but that he will fail in the true measure of the great work to which he has given himself.

Earnest convictions are essential to any work that requires labor and struggle. It was this that made Napoleon the First the unconquerable hero that he was. He believed that he had a mission, that he was the "man of destiny," and that nothing could successfully resist him in his efforts to carry out his plans. So of all the successful men who have ever lived. They have been men of intense earnest convictions, and have gone forward in their work with a zeal and energy which knew no defeat. Shall we ignore all the facts of history in the selection of men to proclaim the Gospel of the grace of God? Shall we be satisfied with the non-committal utterances of candidates for the ministry, who express no deeper conviction of duty than is manifest in the shilly-shally, namby-pamby, lackadaisical style in which they speak of the great work upon which they propose to enter? We must get away from this timid irresolution; this "masterly inactivity;" this doubting hesitancy; this form of godliness without the power. Young men who bear the standard of the Cross to the nations must feel that the highest obligations of life, time, and eternity impel them to the work. They must feel that the work can not be done unless they do it, and that they can not fail in what is proposed, for the "everlasting arms" will be around them, protecting them from all danger; while their ever-blessed and exalted leader will conduct them to glorious and certain victory.

One of the most powerful elements in Spurgeon's character is, that he believes in his mission. He believes that he has been called to do a special work—a work that no other man can do. Hence, he does not go about his business in a trembling, halting, hesitating manner; but whatever his hands find to do he does with all his might. The very moment he comes before the people, you are impressed with the sublime faith which he exercises in his mission. He believes that God has called him to the work of preaching the Gospel, and that, therefore, he can not fail in the accomplishment of great results. He comes before the people *in the name of Christ*, speaks in the name of Christ, asks sinners, in the name of Christ, to obey the Gospel and be saved. Such preaching goes forth with the seal of *authority* on it, and the effect is just what might be reasonably expected—thousands are converted who otherwise would have regarded the Story of the Cross with perfect indifference.

While the Gospel is a Divine message—a message from God—we must never lose sight of the fact that it is intended for *men*, and that it is to be preached *by men to men*. The scheme of redemption places the ministry next to Christ. In the proclamation of the Gospel the minister stands between Christ and the people. And certainly no one should occupy such a place unless he is fully persuaded that he has a special call to it. And we mean by this an overwhelming conviction of duty to preach the Gospel; not the sights and sounds of a mythical theology, or the wild experiences of an unlettered superstition.

We have already intimated that in getting away from Babylon we are in great danger of passing by Jerusalem; that is, in coming out of the smoke of mediæval mysticism, it is possible for us to go to the extreme of a cold, lifeless rationalism. And there is nothing, perhaps, in which we are more liable to practically exemplify this evil than in the type and character of the ministry.

From the foregoing considerations it will be seen that there are some questions which lie back of the actual education of a candidate for the ministry, which must be satisfactorily settled before his education should be considered at all. If he is found to be seriously defective in the qualifications mentioned, all hope should at once be given up as to his ever becoming an effective and successful preacher of the Gospel; and the sooner his attention is turned to something

else, the better it will be for both him and the cause of Christ. It was never intended that all men should preach. And, as we have heretofore only partially recognized this fact in the selection of men for the ministry, we need not be astonished because we now find hundreds of men in the ministry who have very few qualifications for such a calling. Hence, the first great crying want of the ministry to-day is, *a proper selection of men to be educated for the work.*

But the education of these men is a matter of scarcely less importance than their selection. A young man may have all the qualifications to which we have alluded, and yet be completely ruined as an effective preacher by the education he receives. There is no class of men who need education more than ministers of the Gospel; and it may be just as safely affirmed, that there is no class of men whose education is so sadly defective in the essential matters as our modern preachers. Theological seminaries are the mills in which they are ground out. A young man must go through the curriculum of study, no matter what his peculiar talents are. Every one must fare precisely alike, though there should be a difference the width of the poles in tastes, feelings, talents, opportunities, and purposes. Parents do not act so silly in the management of their children at home. They study the peculiar dispositions and circumstances of every one, and seek to make the education correspond to these conditions. In other words, they do not treat all precisely alike—but take into consideration the tastes, habits, purposes, etc., and then aim to make the education accord with these. So should it be in the education of men for the ministry. There should always be a careful consideration of the circumstances, etc., of the candidate, and the education made to conform to these.

It is impossible, as well as altogether unnecessary, to give all who desire to enter the ministry a regular collegiate education. Some of the most efficient preachers of the present day are men who never, in their lives, received an hour's instruction in a college. And again, some who have attended college, and received a college diploma, can lay little claim to scholastic attainments. They have been simply workers, and have had no time, and perhaps less taste, for scholarly achievements. They have been deeply impressed with the *pressing needs of the hour*, and have not given the questions of polished rhetoric, profound erudition, and oratorical display, very much of their



thoughts. Life has been to them too earnest a thing, and the great responsibilities resting on them entirely too heavy, to engage in such pursuits as can yield abundant fruit to only a few.

Nor is it necessary that men should be trained in a Theological college before they are competent to preach the Gospel. Doubtless many brave and earnest hearts have been deterred from entering the ministry because they did not feel equal to the task of passing the review of the professors. They were fully persuaded that they could work for *God*, but they were not so well convinced that they could do the work which *men* required of them.

Thus Theological colleges have worked evil in two ways: first, by creating the idea in the minds of the people that the education of preachers is a sort of manufacturing process, and hence, encouraging a great many young men to enter the ministry who are wholly incompetent for the work; and, secondly, by discouraging a great many who are competent, but who are kept out of the work by the rigid requirements of college professors.

But are we to conclude, because Theological colleges have worked evil, that, therefore, we should have no colleges at all for the education of young men for the ministry? We should not be hasty in coming to such a conclusion. Because there is danger of making these colleges instruments of evil, this is not positive evidence that they should be abandoned entirely. There is danger in almost every thing. It is even a fearful thing to live; but it would surely be very foolish for every body to commit suicide on this account. The wiser course would certainly be to make a good use of life, which will at once largely overcome the danger of living. So with reference to schools for ministerial education. They should not be abandoned because there is danger in them, unless it can be shown that this danger is greater than the amount of good which can possibly come out of them. But this, we are convinced, can not be done. Hence, we should have these schools, but we should be careful to guard them from the flagrant abuses which have so long characterized the management of such institutions.

Having now briefly noticed the manufacturing process, by which preachers are made, we are somewhat prepared to examine critically the product of this process; and hence, we will proceed to consider the ministry as it actually exists to-day.



The ministry is now in a transition state, or, to speak chemically, it is in a state of decomposition. It is rapidly passing out of its old scholastic shell, and taking on new and more active characteristics. It is not so much a study—a thing of the closet—as it was in former years; but it is more of a life—a thing in terrible and earnest conflict with the world. And in this respect it has certainly gained immensely in power. But energies must be properly directed in order to be effective for the good of the world. A locomotive turned loose upon a railroad track, without some one to guide it, may do a great deal of harm. Energy must have intelligence; and this is one of the difficulties with the ministry of modern times. We do not mean that it has not intelligence, in the general sense of that word, but, in the special business to which it is called—the preaching of the Gospel—it is sadly deficient in knowledge. Literature and science are well enough, so far as they go; and it should be the aim of every respectably educated preacher to be as familiar with these as possible, but they can never make him a preacher, nor fit him for the great work of feeding the flock of God. He must draw his knowledge and inspiration from divine sources, for nothing else will enable him to make his work thorough and permanent.

While reading the sermons of Barrow, Jeremy Taylor, and preachers of their class, we wonder that the people could have patience to listen to such long dissertations, so elaborately and learnedly wrought. But we are compelled, after all, to admit that their sermons are far more preferable than many of our half-hour pulpit exhibitions of the present time; for these might be frequently, not inappropriately, called exhibitions of mental weakness in the uninteresting attribute of leanness. The old masters always had something to say, something which bore evidence that it had been dug up from the mines of thought, had passed through the refining process of reflection; and, though bristling with dogmatics, and almost stifled with erudition, the *matter* of these discourses would be an excellent substitute for the “airy nothings,” for the “*vox et præterea nihil*”—panegyrics of modern pulpit oratory. Earle, in his “Microcosmography,” has so wittily and vividly drawn the portraiture of this modern clerical humbug, that we can not do better than quote his own description:

“The labor of his sermon is chiefly in his lungs; and the only thing he has made in it himself is the *faces*. His action is all passion, and his speech

interjections. He will not draw his handkerchief out of his place, nor blow his nose without discretion. His commendation is, that he never looks upon book, and, indeed, he *was never used to it.*"\*

Of course we do not include even a majority of our modern preachers in this description; for we are strongly of the opinion that the ministry of to-day, as a whole, is an improvement on the ministry of the scholastic period, or even the times of Jeremy Taylor. What it has lost in learning it has gained in activity and adaptation to the real necessities of the hour. But it has much yet to gain every way before it will be equal to the great task of converting the world.

We now come to consider the subject of preaching in the light of the Holy Scriptures, and in view of the wants of the present age. And for the sake of perspicuity as well as order, we will examine, first, the *matter*, and, second, the *manner* of pulpit discourse.

1. We have already hinted that the modern pulpit has lost substance when compared with the pulpit of even a century ago. Nor is it very certain that it has gained much in the *character* of the substance of discourse. True, it does not deal so much in theology; but is this deficiency made up by greater attention to Christology? If so, then we are clearly advancing in the right direction, for the first and greatest need of the pulpit is, a clear and more earnest exhibition of Christ in his character and work as the "chief among ten thousand, and as the one altogether lovely." In this respect Mr. Spurgeon is setting the ministry a good example. While he started out with many excellent improvements on the cold formalism of the English pulpit, he has himself made wonderful progress toward the divine idea of preaching. His first sermons were strongly tinged with hyper-calvinism, and not unfrequently some of his best efforts were greatly impaired by watering them with streams flowing from the mountains of "free-will and necessity." But more recently his preaching has been confined more exclusively to the exhibition of Christ, and him crucified. And, in this respect, he is certainly approaching the true idea of preaching. What we all desire to know most, is Christ *himself*; Christ, "the man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief;" Christ, the sorrowing one of Gethsemane; Christ, the suffering one of Calvary; Christ, who lay in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea; Christ, who burst the bars of death, and triumphed over

\* Earle's "Microcosmography," p. 7.

the grave; Christ, who ascended upon high and led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men; Christ, the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end; Christ, who is our "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption;" Christ, who "was dead, but is alive for evermore." This is the theme for the pulpit; this is the only theme that will electrify the people—make them feel the need of a new life and a new hope, and inspire them with holy ambition for a better and more glorious state of existence. Here is where our modern pulpit is sadly defective. We have too much science and not enough of Jesus, the sinner's friend; too many lectures on literature, and not enough of Christ crucified, as the power of God and wisdom of God; too many anecdotes, intended simply to catch the public attention and gain the public applause, and not enough of the story of the Cross, the most wonderful that ever was recorded in the languages of earth. We think, then, that the current preaching of our time would gain greatly in vitality and force if it would give us more of the *personal life of Him* who is "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," and who "ever lives to make intercession for us." We do not undervalue doctrinal preaching. We think this can not be safely dispensed with. In this age of intense activity, religious thought should preserve some consistency, else we will soon pass into a sort of religious anarchy, which is certain spiritual death. But our doctrine should receive its vitality, strength, and authority from Him who is the "Way, the Truth, and the Life." The following, from Mr. Spurgeon, is in the right style:

"A view of Christ is always beneficial to a Christian—too much of Christ we can not have—there can be no tautology where his name is mentioned. Give us Christ always, Christ ever. The monotony of Christ is sweet variety; and even the unity of Christ hath in it all the elements of harmony. Christ on his cross and on his throne, in the manger and in the tomb—Christ every-where, is sweet to us. We love his name, we adore his person; we delight to hear of his works—the theme is ever new.

"There are some who complain that their love to the Savior is faint and cold. But this would not be if they were more with Jesus. The closer you live to Christ, and the more you know him, the better you will love him. Do not try to produce in yourself a certain degree of love to Christ by some extraordinary means, but go into his presence, meditate upon him continually, picture to yourself his sufferings for you, and then you will love him—it will become easy to you, for *he* will draw your poor heart closer to himself as you thus think about him; and your love to him will grow just in proportion as you realize his love to you."

2. The preaching of the present time should be characterized by a more profound knowledge of the teachings of the Word of God. On this subject we find some remarks in the *North British Review* of 1866, so appropriate, and withal so forcible, that we prefer to give the writer's thoughts in his own language:

"Nothing, we are persuaded, has of late contributed more to redeem the preaching of the age, both from intellectual and spiritual commonplace, than the great development, in our day, of a healthy exegetical spirit. The study of divine truth has been resolving itself more and more into the study of the divine Word. Men have been seeking to make their escape from the narrowness and poverty of man's thoughts and words, to the largeness and fullness of the thoughts and words of God. This is, unquestionably, a movement in the right direction. As the reformation of a philosophy was based on the interpretation of nature, so, surely, must the reformation and revivification of theology and preaching be based on the interpretation of Scripture. If system and theory be valuable in their own place, that place is assuredly one subordinate to, and dependent on, interpretation. System must grow out of interpretation, not interpretation out of system. Divine words must be questioned, even as natural facts must be questioned—not merely summoned as 'proof-texts,' to establish a conclusion already foregone."

While we agree with this writer in the necessity of the thing for which he contends, we doubt very much whether the tendency of the ministry is in this direction. That a great many preachers are turning away from the dead systems of the past to the Living Word, can not be denied. In fact, we hail this as one of the favorable indications of the times, and rejoice in the prospect which it promises. It is, however, a sad fact that a large portion of the ministry has not yet adopted the short, but comprehensive motto, "Hear the Word." They are willing to hear almost every thing else. Hence, they say, "Hear the Church," "Hear science," "Hear literature," "Hear history," "Hear human experience," while "the Word of God, which lives and abides forever," and which alone can infallibly speak the things that will enlighten the understanding of men, and guide them in the path of life everlasting, is, in a great measure, silenced amid the din and cry of these human voices.

All true and living preaching must draw its inspiration from the Living Oracles—must be pregnant with the seed of the Kingdom. Nothing else will feed the soul with that "bread which cometh down from Heaven." The faithful preacher must take his message directly from his Master, and he will learn to preach more and more like Christ as he ponders and deeply studies the words of Christ. A

man of ordinary mental capacity, who relies upon the Holy Scriptures as the source of his wisdom, will be able to preach most effectively, where a much more intellectual man, who relies upon other instrumentalities than the Word of God, will signally fail. Hence, we conclude, that our preachers need to rely more upon exegesis, more upon a thorough and comprehensive presentation of the teachings of the Word of God.\*

Of the exegetical class of preachers, (a class which we hope to see greatly augmented,) Mr. Franklin is, in some respects, a good type. His thoughts are often slovenly expressed, but there is in all that he says such a reverence for the Bible, such a manifest desire to know what the will of God is, that you are very willing to forgive any rhetorical defects or ungrammatical sentences. He has the power of making himself understood, and that is the chief matter, after all, when dealing with immortal souls. The following, from a sermon on "The Adaptation of the Bible to Man," and selected almost at random, will serve to show his manner of speaking, as well as the sources of knowledge on which he relies :

"The law of Moses was not a universal law; not for all the world, but for the nation of Israel. The New Testament is adapted to and designed for all the world. It is not simply a book for the Church, for 'us,' 'our brethren,' 'our Church,' but for *the world*. The world is mainly in three divisions: The unbelieving, the believing who are not Christians—not in Christ—and those in Christ. For these three classes the New Testament has also three divisions: The four records of testimony concerning Christ by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. These are not, as many style them, 'four Gospels,' nor 'the four Gospels,' but four records of testimony concerning the Messiah, written by four different men. These records are all of the same nature—all on the same subject, and evidently all have the same design. When we get the design of one of them, we have the design of all. John, the last one, as arranged in the volume called the 'New Testament,' and the one last written, informs us what the design was. John xx, 30, 31. He says: 'Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life through his

\* Men go on perseveringly plowing the old ruts, mistaking dead dogmas for living truths, human artificial forms for the Divine substance. We do not object, as we have already fully shown, to doctrinal preaching, but only to the kind of doctrinal preaching which is still too largely prevalent. It is not doctrine, but *mere* doctrine, hard and stiff doctrine, narrow, one-sided doctrine—doctrine divorced from Scripture exegesis, divorced from experience, divorced from human life—doctrine that may be carried about in a formula, and passed, without thought, or feeling, or heart-conviction, from hand to hand. We want water, drawn not from mere human tanks—whether of Oxford, or Geneva, or Westminster—but from the Divine, living springs.—*North British Review*.

name.' No man can state his purpose, in writing a book, more clearly than this writer does here; and, as before stated, in doing so he also states the purpose of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. That design is, *that the reader may believe 'that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.'* Whatever else the reader may find in these records, he should constantly bear in mind that the leading design is, that *he may believe.* These records of testimony are not to prove any doctrine or creed in the world, but to lay before the reader the evidence concerning Jesus, the anointed Son of God, that he may believe.

"Such being the purpose of these records, how appropriate it is that they should appear first in the volume! In this, too, this book proves its adaptation to the world as no other book in the world does. The department for the unbeliever meets his eye first, and he finds it adapted to him and prepared for him. The books that men have made have left out this grand department entirely, and passed by the unbelieving, making no provision for them. The creed-makers have been so busily engaged in distinguishing their opinions from those differing from them, that they appear to have overlooked and passed by the unbelieving part of mankind. In the Lord's book special provision is made for them, and it is the first thing. In making a believer there must be two things: 1. Something to believe; 2. Credible testimony, bringing that something to the human understanding. In the case in hand, the Lord has furnished that which is to be believed—the truth concerning Jesus, that *he is the Christ, the Son of the living God.* This truth is not always found in precisely the same form or the same words, but always amounting to the same. As the Lord stood on the banks of the Jordan, the Almighty Father embodied it in the following words: 'This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased.' In the mountain of Transfiguration this was repeated, and the following added: 'Hear you him.' As in the brief but all-important confession made by Peter, (Matt. xvi, 16,) it reads as follows: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' 'On this,' the Lord says, 'I will build my Church,' or, 'on this rock.' This is a very perspicuous statement of the central idea of Christ's religion, the transcendently important truth, to be believed. It is not, Thou art Christ, or Anointed—for others had been anointed—but thou art *the* anointed—in a much higher sense than any other had ever been. It is not 'Son of God,' nor 'a Son of God,' nor 'of a God,' but 'of *the living* God;' transcendently above all others called *God*—THE JEHOVAH—THE I AM. The truth to be believed is not that Jesus is Christ, or Anointed, but '*the* Christ, *the* Son of the living God.' The records of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are four records of testimony concerning this great truth. Whoever reads these records understandingly, reads them with his eye fixed on this all-absorbing question, Is Jesus the Son of the living God? as they bear on it from first to last.

"The Lord having furnished the proposition to be believed, and the testimony on which to believe, how should the preacher go to work to make believers? Should he preach a sermon on the philosophy of faith? By no means. Preaching sermons on faith never made a believer in the world. How does a sensible attorney make a jury believe? He delivers no speech on the philosophy of faith or on faith. How, then, does he make his jury believe? He calls his witnesses and has them give their testimony to the jury. After all the testimony is stated, he makes a speech, summing up and applying the testimony and the law to the

case. How should the preacher of Jesus proceed? The people whom he would convince are his jury. The testimony found in the records of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John is the testimony he should lay before them. He should array it, sum it up, apply it to his proposition, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, showing that it is conclusive."

How different are these substantial, evangelical, earnest utterances, from the thin sentimentalisms of Mr. Collyer! There is in Mr. Collyer's sermons no nutritious food for the soul. The style is beautiful, the thoughts chaste and tender, and there is in them that which leaves no doubt of the high æsthetical culture of their author. But æsthetics is not religion. To walk amid flowers, to leisurely stroll through picture galleries, or to become encircled by the most wonderful exhibitions of *nature* and *art*, is one thing; but to come as a poor penitent sinner to the foot of the cross, to seek instruction from Him who is the "resurrection and the life," is another thing altogether. Hence, Mr. Collyer's type of preaching may *please*, may even cultivate and refine us, speaking after the manner of men, but it never can *save us from sin*, and prepare us for that "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." But this is just what we want with preaching, and, if it does not do this, the sooner the lyceum is substituted for the pulpit, the better. If mere lectures on "nature and life" are all that is necessary in order to the growth of the soul, then, by all means, let us have these, and dispense with preaching entirely. But æsthetical culture is one thing, and spiritual life is quite another. One may be promoted by such sermons as Mr. Collyer's, but in order to the development of the other, we need sterner stuff, a more sin-destroying Gospel than we find promulgated by modern rationalists.

3. The preaching of the present day needs to be more *ethical*. It is not enough to convert the people; they must be organized into churches, and developed into strong men and women in Christ. And in order to this, they must be instructed in the principles of the Christian life. They must be taught the exceeding sinfulness of sin and the excellence of virtue; that religion is a personal thing, and in order to a growth in grace and the knowledge of the truth, there must be a constant attention to the minor details of life, as well as the more prominent matters, which are usually considered the only things necessary. The truth is, real life is made up of little



things. Hence, the most insignificant details are of the greatest consequence in developing spiritual growth.

And, surely, unless there is spiritual development in the character and life of the Christian, there is little or no meaning in the expenditure of time and means for the conversion of the world. The preaching which stops with the conversion of the sinner, that simply introduces him into the Kingdom, then leaves him, ignorant of his relations to right and wrong, comes far short of meeting the entire obligations of the pulpit. It is good so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. What we call first principles are very essential; in fact, can not be dispensed with; but there is a class of preachers who never get farther than these. They measure the amount of good they do by the number of additions they are instrumental in making to the Church. They look back for their rewards to the "big meetings" they have held, to the multitudes who were there brought into the Kingdom, rather than to the great future, when the *real* value of every man's work shall be made fully manifest. Their rejoicing is every in the Spring-time, in the day of planting, rather than in the Autumn, when the sheaves are gathered together amid the joyful shouts of "harvest-home."

We would not have our ministers do *less evangelizing*, but we would have them do *more teaching*; give more attention to the actual duties of religion, so that the Churches may every-where be living, earnest instruments for good, rather than the dead things which they too frequently are. Preaching, in short, should not be confined to the *chief* things, but to *all* things that will enable us to walk with and please God. It is one thing to bring a man into the Church, but it is quite another thing to help him on his way to heaven. The first must be done, but the last must not be left undone. In order to have an "abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," we must add to our faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly-kindness, and charity. And the preaching which does not develop these graces in our lives, fails in carrying out an important part of the great commission, namely: "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded."

It can not be said that either Mr. Spurgeon or Mr. Franklin excels in ethical preaching. They are both *aggressive* men, full of



anxiety to get on. Regarding the world as "lying in wickedness," their main object is to convert men, to enlist them under the great Captain of Salvation, and then leave them to be trained by others. True, Mr. Spurgeon has shown considerable ability in sustaining his work and building it up to permanent success. But whoever will examine closely into his labors will find that, after all, his success is chiefly owing to the constant additions made, from the world to the Church, rather than to any spiritual growth of the members, except such as is necessarily produced by the constant exhibitions of the power of the Gospel. But we would not be understood as even intimating that Mr. Spurgeon's preaching has none of the ethical element in it all. On the contrary, many of his sermons are good specimens of ethical preaching; but it is, nevertheless, quite evident that his greatest power, as a preacher, consists in his wonderful ability to awaken the conscience of the unconverted, and present Christ as a loving Savior to the penitent heart. Mr. Franklin's chief power is not exactly this, though he is not deficient in the element of earnest appeal. He is most at home, however, when instructing the already-awakened sinner in the conditions of the Gospel. Three things are essential to a full presentation of the Scheme of Redemption: 1. That man is a sinner. 2. That Jesus is the Savior; and, 3. How Jesus, the Savior, saves the sinner. In the proclamation of the first two points Mr. Spurgeon has no equal, and in a clear statement and enforcement of the last point Mr. Franklin has few superiors. But neither of them is strong in the matter of ethical preaching. This last is Mr. Goulburn's specialty. He has little power to convict sinners, and still less, if possible, to instruct them in the conditions of salvation; but, so far as a deep insight into the morality of Christianity, and power to eloquently and earnestly exhibit the personal aspects of religion are concerned, he is one of the finest preachers of the present century.

4. There is still another defect in the matter of the modern pulpit which needs to be remedied. We refer to the neglect of *practical* preaching—preaching which deals with the *acts* and *realities of life*. Fine-spun theories may afford entertainment to those who have a taste for such things; but if the minister of the Gospel wishes to become a power in exciting the conscience to a sense of sin and an appreciation of holiness; if he wishes to be what every minister

should be—an instrument in the hands of God for making men better and happier—he *must* become familiar with the great matters of the actual experience of men, their thoughts, feelings, and purposes. He must come down to the sorrows, temptations, misgivings, fears, amid which men are struggling, and, by exhibiting a generous sympathy for the *human side* in the great battle of life, win the confidence of poor, fallen men and women, and help them in their conflict with sin.

In this kind of preaching Mr. Beecher excels. He understands the human heart; has a keen appreciation of the motives and influences that impel men to action; knows the times in which he lives; watches, with intense interest, all passing events; and appropriates, with singular readiness, the great lessons of the hour. His theology is exceedingly lame. In fact, it can not be said that he has any theology at all; but his deep insight into the affairs of men, and the relations they sustain to each other, to time, and to eternity, greatly overbalances, so far as giving him power is concerned, all the defects in his theology. To put it in modern phraseology, he is a *live* man, has his eyes and ears open, sees and hears all that is passing, and knows how to make every thing tell in contributing to the strength and vitality of his ministry. As specimens of deep, earnest, practical preaching, many of his sermons are equal to any of their kind in the English language. In working out the spiritual elevation of men, *from the humanity center*, under the great all-controlling, all-powerful principle of love, sanctified and made pure through the influence of suffering, his sermons must and will do great good. But so far as teaching the sinner the way into the Kingdom is concerned, they are little more instructive than the book of Mormon. They are never strictly didactic, but are almost always highly practical. The following is a good specimen, taken from his sermon entitled "Crowned Suffering:"

"Hitherto religion, considered comprehensively and systematically, has not extended its force enough in the right direction. It has been a means of educating the conscience. Good men have been under the dominion chiefly of conscience since the world began; and, although religion has in it, unquestionably, an element of education for the conscience, yet that is not the distinguishing element. Religion has been a code of rules for conduct; it has been a system of ethics or morality; it has been introduced into external laws, and institutions, and functions; and it is to-day, to a limited extent, an instrumentality for external

recreation, but this is only the lower and earlier development of religion. Religion, as a love, taking precedence of all the other elements of the soul, asserting its authority, and compelling every thing else to bow to it, and to take law from it, has hardly been known except in single individuals. It has been but little known as an idea, and still less as a practical matter. We have had sporadic cases, but it has never been, to any considerable degree, wrought into the public sentiment of any age. The active force of the world has never been this great motive power of the Divine government. Religion has spent itself in marking out right paths for conduct, or securing penalties, or building churches and ecclesiastical institutions; religion has spent itself in worship, in minor charities, in refinements, in a thousand beneficent ways, but it has not thus fulfilled its whole mission. The day, however, is coming when the Church, when religion itself, is to take on the form of suffering love. Men seek to shield their love from suffering, or, if it must suffer, they seek to reap the field for themselves. A love that suffers for others, not once, and by a heroic struggle, but always, and easily, and naturally, is almost unknown. But there is to be a new disclosure in this matter. Much light has dawned, more is yet to dawn. And it is to come, not by dry mathematical problems; it is to come, not by the text; it is to come by putting on this suffering love of Christ Jesus! The full light is to come by development. Out of a nobler conception of love is to come nobler life—out of the experience of the full, tropical Summer of sacrificing, suffering love. And then the earth will put forth fruits such as were never suspected or dreamed of."

We have already consumed so much space in discussing the *matter* of discourse, that we have little room to say much concerning *manner*. Nor do we consider it necessary to treat this part of the subject at length, as it is only of secondary importance. Still, we would, by no means, undervalue a *proper manner*. It is certainly no recommendation to fine thoughts to have them delivered in a sort of hugger-mugger, jerking-out-of-words style; nor should we deem it a recommendation to a minister if he has contracted the habit of speaking in the professional, whang-doodle, drawling manner, which not unfrequently characterizes the modern pulpit. Such a style should not be tolerated *any where*, and certainly not in the pulpit. But it really seems as if ministers of the Gospel were laboring under the impression that this style belongs exclusively to them, and is a kind of mark of ministerial profession. We hope, however, that the time will not be long before the spell of this delusion is broken, for it is now both a shame and weakness of the pulpit, and should, therefore, at once and forever be abandoned.

We want more *manliness* in the pulpit. Our ministers should speak as men to men; should speak in the clear, dignified style of conscious rectitude; should speak as if they had some appreciation

of their high and holy calling, and had an earnest desire for the salvation of souls. Over-strained erudition on one hand, and commonplace on the other, should give way to a simple, unaffected, natural style—a common-sense presentation of the Gospel.\*

We want, also, more *directness* in the manner of our pulpit. Circumlocutions are not in harmony with the spirit of the age, and will only serve as cradles in which to rock the people to sleep. Any preacher of the Gospel, who would now make a positive impression upon the people, must speak directly to them, in a language as pointed as it is possible to use.

Men are not going to New York by the way of New Orleans when there is a direct route by which they can save both time and money. Neither will they listen to preaching which consumes *patience*, as well as time and money; consequently, sermons, to be effective, should be short and pointed, and as free from unnecessary verbiage as possible. Dr. Neale tells us that "the ancient sermon contained many thoughts in few words, whereas the modern deals in many words and few thoughts;" but we do not think this is a fair representation of the matter. While the old masters were more learned, we are confident that their preaching was not as direct and as well adapted to the wants of the people as the preaching of modern times. Still we can not deny that the modern pulpit needs improvement, with respect even to directness.

But, above all, we need more *earnestness*. While nothing can compensate for a want of this, this may excuse a great many other defects. The common people, of all classes, like earnest speech. Doubtless, this is one reason why they heard the Savior gladly. His utterances bore with them the evidence that they came from a deeply earnest heart, one profoundly impressed with the sad condition of men, and their great need of help. His words were full of sympathy for the race, and the intonations of his voice rung through

\*"I would not have preachers, in their sermons, use Hebrew, Greek, or foreign languages, for, in the church, we ought to speak as we used to do at home, the plain mother-tongue, which every one is acquainted with. It may be allowed in courtiers, lawyers, advocates, etc., to use quaint, curious words. Dr. Staupitz is a very learned man, yet he is a very irksome preacher; and the people had rather hear a plain brother preach, that delivers his words simply to their understanding, than he. In churches, no praising or extolling should be sought after. St. Paul never used such high and stately words as Demosthenes and Cicero did, but he spake, properly and plainly, words which signified and showed high and stately matters; and he did well."—*Table Talk of Luther*, p. 228-9.

the hearts of the people like the swelling melodies of hope. Consequently the multitudes followed him and hung on his deeply earnest eloquence.

The great problem of the pulpit to-day is, How shall we reach the masses? how shall the great *people* be converted to Christ? We believe that this problem can be solved only by having a reformation in the pulpit, both in matter and manner. The Gospel must be preached in its purity and simplicity, in all its facts, conditions, and promises, as "*the* power of God unto salvation to every one that believes it." Then there must be a corresponding teaching in "all things whatsoever is commanded," a practical application of the principles of the Christian religion to the solemn affairs of human life; and then all this must be insisted upon in a simple, unaffected, perspicuous, direct, earnest style—a style in harmony with the great and mighty realities of which it treats, that will rivet the attention, and make the hearer realize that the Christian religion is something more than a mere form, but is a fruitful and glorious life, which shall finally be rewarded with an unfading crown and joys eternal at God's right hand. With such a ministry the Church will soon become as "bright as the sun, as fair as the moon, and as terrible as an army with banners."

## II.—THE FELLOWSHIP.

*"And they adhered steadfastly to the teaching of the apostles, and to the fellowship, to breaking of bread, and to the prayers." ACTS II, 42.*

IT does not need to be argued here that the second chapter of Acts contains a record of the first sermon that announced a complete redemption; the first accomplishment of the promised mission of the Holy Spirit to convict sinners and comfort saints, (John xvi, 7-14;) the first authoritative announcement of Jesus as Lord and Christ; the first publication of the Law of Pardon under the reign of the new Lawgiver, and the planting of the first Church of Christ. Its importance, therefore, as a starting point in our labors to restore New Testament Christianity, can hardly be exaggerated. That we have succeeded in developing, from this chapter, the beginning of the reign of the Christ, the mode of the Spirit's operation in the conversion of sinners, the unchanging law of pardon and of initiation into the Church of Christ, the infallible authority of the apostles to administer the affairs of the absent Lord, and the simple, spiritual worship of the primitive Church, is also, we think, beyond question.

On one subject, however, there has been dimness—that of the Fellowship. That the first Church adhered as steadfastly to the fellowship as to the teaching of the apostles, is positively affirmed; but precisely what is meant by fellowship, and how they continued in it, has been matter of so much doubt as to leave our Churches largely destitute of the blessings of fellowship, and render them failures, so far as this feature of primitive Christianity is concerned.

We propose, therefore, an examination of this word, and of its applications in Scripture, that we may ascertain if any definite conclusion can be reached as to its Scriptural import.

If it can be said to have any definite meaning among us, it is understood to signify the weekly contribution of money for benevolent purposes. Taking this as its strict import, there has been among us no other such instance of trifling with a Divine ordinance; for the paltry contribution, week by week, of dimes and half-dimes

by one-fourth or one-fifth of the members present at a Church meeting, is a shameful slurring over of any just idea of *fellowship* in a solemn duty enjoined on all the saints. It is a custom, we take it, "more honored in the breach than in the observance;" for there is just enough done to lull the conscience of the selfish into quietness, and to belittle one's ideas of Christian benevolence, while, for all the great purposes of true Church life, it is so insignificant as to inherit only contempt. It is offering the bran to God and keeping the flour to ourselves. Is this what is meant by Fellowship? Let us see.

*κοινωνία*, here rendered *fellowship*, is not a term of doubtful import. In classic use *κοινός* signifies *common, shared in common*; in social and political relations, *common to all the people, public, the common weal*; of disposition, *tending a ready ear to all, impartial; connected by common origin, kindred*, especially of brothers and sisters. These are its principal classic uses, as given by Liddell and Scott. The same authority defines *κοινωνία*, *communion, community, intercourse*. Its sacred use is given in New Testament lexicons as *fellowship, partnership, participation, communion, aid, relief, contribution in aid*.

It will be seen, at a glance, that unless the Scriptures make a rigorous application of this term to some one specific act or ordinance, the word itself would suggest nothing of the kind, but would rather lead us to think of community of interest or of obligation—of the spiritual kinship established in Christ, the *partnership* of duties, of interest, and of destiny which is peculiar to the great brotherhood called the Church of God.

We ask, then, Do the Scriptures limit this term to a specific act or ordinance? The best answer to this is found in the texts in which the word occurs:

Acts ii, 42: They continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and *fellowship*.

Rom. xv, 26: To make a certain *contribution*.

1 Cor. i, 9: Called unto the *fellowship* of his Son.

1 Cor. x, 16: Is it not the *communion* of the blood? is it not the *communion* of the body of Christ?

2 Cor. vi, 14: What *communion* hath light with darkness?

2 Cor. viii, 4: And take upon us the *fellowship*.

2 Cor. ix, 13: For your liberal *distribution*.

2 Cor. xiii, 14: The *communion* of the Holy Ghost.



- Gal. ii, 9: The right hands of *fellowship*.  
 Eph. iii, 9: What is the *fellowship* of the mystery?  
 Phil. i, 5: For your *fellowship* in the Gospel.  
 Phil. ii, 1: If any *fellowship* of the Spirit.  
 Phil. iii, 10: And the *fellowship* of his sufferings.  
 Philem. 6: That the *communication* of thy faith.  
 Heb. xiii, 16: And to *communicate* forget not.  
 1 John i, 3: May have fellowship with us; and truly our *fellowship* is with the Father.  
 1 John i, 6: If we say that we have *fellowship*.  
 1 John i, 7: We have *fellowship* one with another.

We add to these the occurrences of *κοινωνός*:

- Matt. xxiii, 30: We would not have been *partakers*.  
 Luke v, 10: Which were *partners* with Simon.  
 1 Cor. x, 18: *Partakers* of the altar.  
 1 Cor. x, 20: Ye should have *fellowship* with.  
 2 Cor. i, 7: As ye are *partakers* of the sufferings.  
 2 Cor. viii, 23: He is my *partner* and fellow-helper.  
 Philem. 17: If thou count me, therefore, a *partner*.  
 Heb. x, 33: Ye became *companions* of them.  
 1 Peter v, 1: And also a *partaker* of the glory.  
 2 Peter i, 4: Be *partakers* of the Divine nature.

It will be readily seen that the term is not restricted to a special use—is limited to no specific application as indicating a particular act or observance of a particular ordinance; but is freely used to express almost every phase of that precious spiritual fellowship which links Father, Son, and Holy Spirit with those who are baptized into these sacred names, and all the baptized, in one great copartnery. The joint privileges, responsibilities, and duties of all the members of this spiritual family, as well as their common relationship to God as their Father, to the Son as their Redeemer, and to the Holy Spirit as their Comforter, all find expression in this word.

It is readily granted that this word is sometimes used in reference to money—joint contributions for benevolent purposes. It is not only readily granted, but we are anxious to have it known, that it may be fully understood that in regard to outlays of money for all good purposes there is a *joint responsibility*—a partnership, from the duties of which no member of the firm is to be allowed to escape. But what we now are desirous to impress upon our readers is, that this does not exhaust the applications of the word; that it has a



much wider range, and conveys a much larger idea of our relationships and duties, than can be found in it when this specific application is urged. It expresses partnership in the blessings of the death of Christ, (1 Cor. x, 16;) in the strength and comfort of the Holy Spirit, (2 Cor. xiii, 14;) in the sufferings of Christ, (Phil. iii, 10;) in all the blessings of the Gospel, (Phil. i, 5;) in the favor and protection of God, (1 John i, 3.)

Nor is it necessary to deny that there is a somewhat special use of the term in the immediate application of it in Acts ii, 42. Verses 44, 45 favor the idea that in its first use it was meant to describe that generous outflow of regenerated hearts in which all participated; but as none of those for whom we are now writing insist on this as any part of the permanent order of the Church, we have a general agreement that this does not exhaust the import of *the fellowship*, and that we must seek farther for a full comprehension of its meaning.

The passage most nearly parallel with Acts ii, 42, is 1 John i, 3: "*The things which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, (the apostle's doctrine,) that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.*"

In the light of the classical and Scriptural import of this term, we are constrained to regard the Church of God as a grand partnership, in which God and man come into most intimate relations. In this firm there are *Divine* partners—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and these three agree in one. There are also *human* partners. All who are baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit enter into partnership with God and with each other, for certain clearly defined purposes.

In brief, these objects are, 1. To redeem a world of perishing sinners from ignorance, sin, and death; 2. To educate such as are saved for the dignities and felicities of immortality. To lift men of all nations and all generations from death to life, from sin to holiness, from vileness and shame to glory and honor, and make the heirs of wrath and ruin the inheritors of heaven's immortal honors and delights; this is the mighty enterprise which God has set on foot, to which Father, Son, and Holy Spirit give their united treasures of wisdom, love, and power, and in which they invite the coöperation of all who have hearts to love and hands to toil.

We stand in the presence of this stupendous scheme, awed into reverence and adoration, and seem to hear the voice of God sounding in our ears: "Take off thy shoes from thy feet, for the ground whereon thou standest is holy ground." To us it is idle to ask for other evidence of the divine origin of the Gospel. Any one familiar with the workings of his own heart, or the history of the human race, knows the inevitable tendency to ever-increasing selfishness. The history of our race is a history of grasping selfishness. Self, kindred, sect, country—these exhaust the love and sympathy of the human heart; and even the free play of these is disturbed within these narrow circles by selfish antagonisms. But *philanthropy*—where does that dwell? Who loves *the race*? What school of uninspired ethics ever taught this sublime virtue? Even after enjoying the light of Christ's teachings for eighteen hundred years, the World and the Church are controlled by narrow selfishness; the great lessons of philanthropy are not half comprehended; the Earth is drunk with blood; the groans of the oppressed issue even from under the altar; the narrow and virulent spirit of sect is the highest inspiration of most religious movements; and

"Man's inhumanity to man  
Makes countless thousands mourn."

When we see through what slow and painful processes men are enabled to grasp the conception which the Gospel furnishes of the love of man as man, and how utterly unworthy are our best conceptions of what is due to our fellow-creatures, who can believe that the selfish heart of man ever gave birth to such a scheme of benevolence as the New Testament unfolds? "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." Talk not of miracles and prophecies. The grandest of all miracles is the Sinless Sufferer dying to redeem the race that scorned him; and all the tongues and harps of prophets are hushed into dead silence before that matchless oracle, "*God so loved the World that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have eternal life.*" Philosophy is dumb; the worthiest religions are abashed; the glories of the grandest empires fade into nothingness; sages, poets, statesmen, heroes—even the purest and best of them—are nothing, and less than nothing, and altogether vanity, when this founder of the everlasting

age reveals his wonderful counsel, and projects this divine scheme of the universal Brotherhood of Man under the Fatherhood of God.

Into this grand partnership all true believers enter. In it they stand on one common platform as brethren in the Lord. All the selfish and wicked distinctions prevailing in human society are lost. There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither male nor female, neither bond nor free, but all are one in Christ Jesus. Redeemed from a common ruin by a common ransom, and made heirs of a common inheritance, they meet on the common level of Christian brotherhood—the rich rejoicing that he is made low, the poor that he is exalted, and all that they are the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. There are no ecclesiastical dignities even. No man is allowed to be called master. “All ye are brethren.” All are priests to God—all constitute God’s clergy or heritage. 1 Pet. v, 3. The least in the kingdom is, by virtue of his redemption and sanctification in Christ Jesus, greater than the greatest official dignitaries. Matt. xi, 11. Nay, it is more to be a member of this grand copartnery than to be the brightest and highest angel in Heaven; for the latter are *all* ministering servants of the former, (Heb. i, 14,) and in their highest ministries they are honored with no such mission as belongs to the members of this fellowship.

Let it now be said—and this brings us into the very heart of our subject—that *every one coming into this partnership brings in with him all his capital, and invests it all in the common stock for the benefit of the firm.*

The highest, deepest, vastest treasures of Divine wisdom, love, power, holiness, justice, truth, mercy, compassion, and condescension are invested in this scheme. The ineffable glories and riches of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are embarked in it. “The unsearchable riches of Christ,” “the depths of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God,” and the “deep things” of the Spirit, are all funded for the benefit of this enterprise. The universe is laid under tribute—the wealth of the ages belongs to it.

Every convert brings into the common treasury all that he owns. In this fellowship “no man lives to himself.” It is written over the door of entrance, “Ye are not your own.” It is a mistake to suppose that having “all things common” was peculiar to the Church in Jerusalem. That particular form of bestowal and distribution evidently

grew out of peculiar circumstances; but in *principle* and in *essence*, the religion is the same; and, although a change in circumstances may work a change in the *incidents* of giving, the duty of bringing our all and laying it down at the apostles' feet, to be appropriated under apostolic authority, is the same now as then—and the *Ananiases and Sapphiras who keep back part of the price will yet be carried out dead, as liars against the Spirit of God.*

We are aware that these are "hard sayings," and that many will ask, "Who, then, can be saved?" We can only reply, "With men these things are impossible, but with God all things are possible." It is time that all who are "at ease in Zion" had a "woe" sounded in their ears that may startle them from their false security. It is time to strip off the delusive idea that any acceptance of doctrine, or any formal observance of ordinances, can avail to save a soul that refuses entire consecration of all its powers to the great aims of the Church of God. It is especially due to the integrity of the Gospel and the purity of the Church, that the narrow and mean selfishness which gives to God its tithings of mint, and anise, and cumin, and reserves for the lusts of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, its wealth of devotion, service, and money, should be branded as an accursed thing, and banished without the camp.

As individual stewards of God, we have a control of our means which others have not, and have a right to employ our resources, under a sense of our personal accountability to the Master; but as *partners* in this great scheme, we owe to the firm our *just share* of toil and of money, and of whatever we possess that the partnership needs. We speak not of money only nor chiefly, *but of whatever we possess that the common cause requires.* "Freely ye have received, freely give." "For we, being many, are one body in Christ, *and every one members one of another.*"

We have said that the ordinary bases of human distinction are ignored in this brotherhood. There is no aristocracy of wealth, nor of intellect, nor of blood. All these are perishable; *but the heart may grow forever.* Goodness is immortal. Love is more than all knowledge, all eloquence, all power. This brotherhood, therefore, is based on *character*—on the possession of the love of God; for "he that loveth is born of God and knoweth God."

There is, however, a variety of gifts, and there must be wisdom

and economy in their appropriation. While, then, all the members of this fellowship stand on a common platform of dignity as children of God, it does not follow that there shall be no official distinctions—no division of labor. God has wisely distributed his gifts so that every one shall have need of his brethren, and all his brethren shall have need of him. This mutual dependence makes society indispensable, and saves us from lawless invasions of the rights of others. But as equal partners in a mercantile firm, possessing different gifts, will make such a division of labor as will enable every one to work most successfully for the benefit of all—one acting as book-keeper, another as salesman, another attending to the purchases, another to collections, etc.—so here, wisdom demands that the variety of gifts shall be classified, and their possessors assigned to such departments of service as will render them most useful to the interests of the Partnership. To illustrate:

1. Here is one on whom is bestowed the “gift of tongues.” He is an orator. He brings his treasures of eloquence and lays them down at the feet of the apostles. Now, he is under no more obligations to preach the Gospel than any other member of the Church, except as his gift lies in that direction. It is the business of the Partnership to preach the Gospel, but the law of the apostles—the directors of this enterprise—is, “As every one has received the gift, so let him minister.” “But,” this brother says, “I have a family to support; the duty to provide for them is imperative; I can not preach only subordinately to their maintenance.” But other members of the Partnership come forward and say, “You can preach better than we; we can make money better than you. You attend to our preaching—we will see to your money-making. You preach—we will make money; *and we will share*. We will be partners in your preaching, and you shall be a partner in our money-making.” This is “*fellowship*.” The preaching and the money-making are alike *in the firm*.

2. Here is one gifted to *rule*—a rare gift. It is all-important that it be made available for the general good; and if the general interests require that his whole time be given to this work, then the Partnership must see that while he attends to their interests, they attend to his. So of teachers, ministers, etc. If the Partnership demands all their time, or a considerable portion of it, they must be maintained by the Partnership. And then righteousness requires that, in the

service of the Partnership, *they religiously render service equivalent to that which they receive from it.* If there must be an end to the selfishness and penuriousness of Church-members, *there must also be an end to the indolence of preachers.* The round of easy visits at favorite resorts—the daily snooze—the hours of idle gossip—the week-long loungings, fishings, and recreations, must give place to hard study and hard work for those who are working for him; and, we opine, there will be less complaint of poorly paid preachers when they earn a fair title to compensation by incessant toil, such as other callings demand in order to success.

3. Praying, singing, exhorting—gifts in these directions are not equally distributed. A wise division of labor in these departments is essential to the complete edification of the Church. It should be understood that none is at liberty to withhold the talents which could be employed for the general good; but that, under the direction of the competent authorities, every one shall bring in his capital into the fellowship.

4. Money-making is a gift. Some men are evidently sent into this world on purpose to make money; and, in spite of pulpit homilies and diatribes to the contrary, we hold that those whose gifts from God fit them for successful business life, may “buy and sell and get gain” as religiously as they can pray or sing, and as much “to the glory of God.” In no paths of life are there better opportunities to glorify God than in the daily walks of business life, in perpetual contact with men, and amid phases of life and revelations of heart that show the surest avenues to the judgment and the conscience, for men’s salvation. The error is not in making money, nor so much in bending one’s energies to the task—for “whatever is worth doing is worth doing well;” but it is *in failing to bring the gift into the Partnership.* These money-makers must learn to “continue steadfastly in the fellowship;” and if they refuse to do so, they ought, after due admonition and patient effort to save them, to be dismissed from the firm. The man of wealth is under as sacred an obligation to bring his money into the Partnership, as is the orator to bring his gifts of speech, or the musician his gifts of song, or the ruler his ability to govern. Nor, if we have a multiplicity of gifts, can the appropriation of any one of them be accepted in lieu of the others. If we combine wealth and the ability to rule, or the ability to preach,

we can not make the bestowal of the gift of preaching a reason for withholding the gift of money, any more than the eyes can insist on rendering precisely equal service with the nose, or the hands with the feet. Every member of the body is under obligations to render all the service it can for the general weal; and whether that be much or little, all the other members are partakers of its benefits. The *principle* is still true which is expressed in the Old Testament: "*They that gathered much had nothing over; and they that gathered little had no lack.*"

5. There are many other gifts which we will not take space to enumerate here, which a wise supervision of the interests, wants, and capacities of the Church will call into exercise. It may be safely laid down as a principle, that no member of the Partnership should remain unemployed.

This gives to the Eldership in our Churches a much more responsible task than is generally allowed to them, or than they are willing to accept. An *Overseer*, in this Partnership, should learn of the various gifts at his disposal. He should be a good judge of men—capable of seeing at a glance the places to be filled, and the persons best qualified to fill them. He should be able to train them for their work, and to go before them in it.

"And as a bird each fond endearment tries  
To tempt its new-fledged offspring to the skies,  
He tries each art, reproves each dull delay,  
Allures to brighter worlds, and leads the way."

When we come to understand the *working* character of the Church, the selection of overseers and guides will be a much graver task than at present, and the work of an overseer will be found to demand the highest and rarest qualifications, and daily and hourly attention. Moreover, the insubordination now so prevalent will be condemned as dishonorable and injurious to the general interest, and it will be required that when the appointed rulers direct any one to a given work, it shall be accepted, unless there are satisfactory reasons for declining the task. Let the reader turn to Rom. xii, and 1 Cor. xii, and give them careful attention, and he can not fail to be convinced that the ideal Church presented to us in the New Testament is that of a community bound by common ties in a spiritual communism, to the prosperity of which every member is bound to



communicate to the full extent of his or her ability; and that its variety of ministries is under a suitable headship. This is the "Fellowship" of the Scriptures. The door-keeper and the ruler—the orator and the janitor—are *partners* in a mutual work.

But while we pass by numerous ministries which a wise oversight will provide for, there are some strangely neglected services to which we feel bound to call special attention.

*Why is it that Christian women find so little employment in the service of the Church?* Not only is their position inferior, but it is largely useless. They do, indeed, make a little work for themselves in a Dorcas society; they are sometimes dignified as Deaconesses—it being understood that the sum of their duties is to prepare female candidates for baptism; and if a festival is called for to coax money out of unwilling hands for the purchase of a church carpet, or a new stove pipe, the culinary skill of the sisters is invoked right earnestly. But except in occasional service of this kind, the sum of a woman's duty in the Church is to listen reverently, and, with a hymn-book before her, to sing by rote! We can not forbear asking, why this persistent refusal to enlist the warm devotions, and generous sympathies, and earnest activities of Woman in this high service? She is more religious than man. She has greater powers of endurance in patient toil and suffering. There is abundant work which can best be done under the promptings of womanly instincts, and by the gentleness of womanly ministrations. Does not the Apostle say, "*There is neither male nor female?*" Let it be granted that there are duties from which her sex and her peculiar organization debar her. Are there not duties enough left for which she is admirably adapted?

Her loving ministries in behalf of the despised Nazarene are among the most touching illustrations of faith and devotion in the Gospel narratives; her steadfast adherence to the Man of Sorrows is marred by no cowardice, disgraced by no treachery.

"Not she with traitorous kiss her Savior stung,  
Not she denied him with unholy tongue;  
She, when apostles shrank, could dangers brave—  
Last at the cross, and earliest at the grave."

In the primitive Church she shared the labors and honors of the Partnership. The women with the men continued, "with one accord," in prayer and supplication till the hour of Pentecostal solemn-



nity and triumph. The promised Spirit came to the *daughters* as well as to *sons*—to the *maidens* equally with the *young men*. Dorcas, Lydia, the daughters of Philip, Phœbe, Priscilla, Euodias, and Syntyche are specimens of the active ministers of the Church who, in various capacities, were “fellow-workers” with the apostles and brethren. Let us mention some kinds of active service in which godly women might find useful employment.

1. In our cities and large towns there are thousands and tens of thousands of neglected people who never attend Church, and whose moral condition would be an offense even to heathenism. They can only be reached by personal visitations, by benevolent attentions, by schools and religious meetings conducted in their midst. There are also thousands of outcasts, driven to a life of shame by the heartlessness of society and the wrongs of offenders who go unwhipped of justice. They are encompassed with the horrors of utter hopelessness, and sink into the depths of crime under the irresistible pressure of a false public sentiment. We can not burden this paper with the startling statistics which are now before us—a fearful dishonor to any Christian land.

Now, our ministers, and elders, and leading men excuse themselves, on the score of pressing engagements, from any labors in these directions; and, generally, we are inclined to regard the excuse as just. But here are intelligent and godly women, who have to toil for daily bread, to whom this would be a welcome work. A very moderate compensation would enlist them at once. They would glide like angels of mercy through these dark scenes of woe and despair, and in the name of Jesus open the prison doors of captive souls, bind up broken hearts, and make known to them that sit in darkness the light of life. Why are they not employed? Who can tell? With the large wealth of intelligence, and sympathy, and strength that lies idle in our Churches, is it possible to go before God free from the blood of these perishing souls?

2. There are much-needed ministries to be established among the homeless sick and dying. Homes, hospitals, asylums, refuges, are needed for the victims of misfortunes. It is the work of the Church. It is woman's work. The State may attempt to accomplish it, and we may attempt to stifle our consciences by the reflection that we have paid our taxes; but there is a work for the

Church which the State can not do—spiritual ends to be sought which can be reached through no State machinery, and a *sympathetic* labor to be accomplished which no State system can command. Women like Elizabeth Fry, Dorothea Dix, Florence Nightingale, and the nameless host of worthies who, during our late war, were present on battle-field, in the march, in the ambulance, and in every hospital, abundantly and gloriously illustrate the capacity, bravery, endurance, and administrative ability of woman in such work. The growing power of the Roman Catholic Church in this country is asserted over the best class of converts by the gentle and loving ministries of her sisterhoods. It is more invincible than logic. You argue in vain in the presence of toilsome, patient, and gentle ministries that touch every heart and bring tears to every eye. It hides a multitude of sins. Unless Protestants awake to the demands of the times, and furnish at least equal proofs of needed benevolence, they will be shorn of their power. The power of the primitive Church was largely in her Divine charities; the Church of to-day must not be wanting in this particular, or learning, eloquence, wealth, and respectability will not be sufficient to save her from disgrace.

3. The mission work, at home and abroad, opens many channels of usefulness for woman. Where the heaviest amount of labor is private rather than public—and this is the case in almost all new missionary fields—woman can be the ready and efficient helper of man. In our own land, among the freedmen, there is employment for thousands of patient, gentle, pious women; and the Church has them and ought to send them.

We pretend not to have exhausted, in our statement, the opportunities for profitable employment for Christian women; but we have said enough to show that there *are* such opportunities, and that it is a great folly, if not a great sin, on the part of the Church, to shut out so much of her worthiest force from participation in the "fellowship" of labor and of reward.

If we have said but little of *money* as belonging to the fellowship, it is not because we deem it unimportant, but rather because that phase of the subject has been faithfully sketched by other pens, while those phases which have engaged our attention have been largely overlooked. We take occasion to say, however, that in

money, as in all other elements of power, there must be *partnership*. It is but a partial restoration of the "ancient order of things" which leaves this unaccomplished. While we are not convinced that there is any Divine law prescribing a uniform method of raising money, we are quite sure that, as a general rule, the method prescribed by Paul to the Corinthians and Galatians is the cheapest, easiest, justest, and most effective of all known expedients: "On the first day of every week let *every one* lay by him in store, as *God has prospered him*." This will always give money in hand, will save all expensive agencies, will keep Churches out of debt, and enable them to appropriate to her various benevolent enterprises a fair proportion of means. He who shall educate the Churches to faithfulness in this particular will render to the cause of God a service of incalculable value.

Before closing we must offer a few suggestions touching another and most important phase of this subject—fellowship with God and with Christ.

There are many Christian lives that partake more of the bondage of the law than of the liberty of the Gospel. They lack sunshine. They are consciously far away from "the fellowship of the Spirit." They are unblessed with any Divine manifestations, un comforted with any "earnest of the inheritance." It is all tame and hard drudgery. They sigh for the light of God's countenance, and sigh in vain. Tell them to read the Scriptures, and they will confuse you with assertions of its utter fruitlessness in their own experience. Urge them to pray, and they will tell you that all their prayers have failed to produce one rift in the clouds that hang in thick darkness over them.

These are cases which need to be treated in the light of these teachings concerning fellowship. A man may live in the Church, and share

"Her sweet communion, solemn vows,  
Her hymns of love and praise,"

and still fail of joyful fellowship *with his brethren*. Why? Because he is not a *partner* with them in their toils and anxieties. He sings, but he does not work; he prays, but he does not pay; he communes in the Supper, but he does not commune in the sacrifices, and toils, and cares of the house of God. Consequently, "there is a great

gulf" between him and them; while they are rejoicing over the fruits of their labors, and happy in projecting new toils, his barren heart pines in desolation. He lives in the midst of love without enjoying it. *He must come on to the same plane of labor and suffering with them* if he would enjoy their fellowship. And if such a failure shuts one out from the fellowship of *his brethren*, is it strange that it should shut him out from *the fellowship of God*? Not at all. Prayer is indispensable to this fellowship; so is Bible knowledge; but these are not all. A man can not pray himself into fellowship with the *suffering* Christ; he must suffer with him. He can not *read* himself into fellowship with the *loving* Christ; he must give himself to similar labors of love, and in such experiences as that life gives him he will be able to interpret the heart of Christ and enter into its sympathies. There will be no lack of influx of heavenly light and peace when we place our souls in a position to receive it. But religion is not mere sentiment, nor a mere creed, nor a ritual; *it is a life*. He who would know its treasures must partake of its life. "If a man love me, *he will keep my sayings*; and he shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." "Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If any man *hear my voice*, and *open the door*, I will come in and sup with him, and he with me." But the voice of Jesus calls us to share his labors and his sorrows; and if we "open the door" it is to bid him welcome, to take us and guide us into his own paths of self-abnegation and self-sacrifice. It is only in some Gethsemane that we can understand the tempests that swept over his soul, or know the sweet peace that succeeded; only when the world has altogether forsaken us that we can see the strong angel of God at our side; only through the Cross that we can reach the crown. The poor woman who cast all her living into the treasury of the Lord could have better interpreted the sayings and doings of Jesus, and have approached into a more immediate intimacy with him, than the most learned and acute of selfish, carnal, ease-loving Pharisees or Sadducees in the land. It is thus that his counsels are hidden from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes.

It can not but be evident, in the light of the considerations we have submitted, that our Churches have by no means fully entered into "the fellowship." We have resources enough to fulfill our

mission, but they fail of appropriation. *There is no genuine partnership* of labor and of expenditure. The mass of our membership exhaust their piety in church-going, sermon-listening, and the payment of such trifling sums as must be paid to maintain a respectable standing. The genuine workers are few; so are the voluntary contributors. There is no consecration of *all* to Christ—no laying down of all our treasures at the Apostles' feet. The result is leanness, barrenness, impotency. We are smitten with mildew and blasting—the locusts and caterpillars eat up our substance. We receive as we give. We give little to God, and we receive little in return. We are shut out from the highest *joys* of spiritual fellowship, because we shut ourselves out from its highest *duties*. We are looking for happiness in a wrong direction. We seek it in selfishness, in ease, in the world's voluptuousness; it is found in giving, in toiling, in suffering, in condescension, in compassion, in self-denial for others' good. Its abode is in Bethlehem, in Gethsemane, at Calvary, and in the eternal home of love and joy to which *these only* lead. We can only know the "power of Christ's resurrection" after we have known "the fellowship of his sufferings," and have been made "conformable to his death." The beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount distill not in the souls that riot in abundance and revel in selfish enjoyments. Heaven's immortal fellowships belong only to a brotherhood of heroic and patient sufferers, who have "come up out of great tribulation, and washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

Man of Sorrows! Divine Sufferer! Toiling Son of God! teach us to be willing to know the fellowship of thy labors and thy sorrows, and to give our little all to Thee, who gavest all for us. Then shall we have fellowship with each other; then will thy blood cleanse us from all sin; then shall we have unclouded views of thy glory, and rise to the possession of the everlasting fellowship of heavenly rest and joy.

III.—AN INFALLIBLE CHURCH, OR AN INFALLIBLE  
BOOK—WHICH?

THERE is an unappeasable longing in every heart for spiritual repose. "Come unto me," said the Savior, "and I will give you rest." It is obvious, from this passage, that Jesus himself recognizes this universal desire, and that he has provided for it. The soul can not, and if it be healthy will not, long brook uncertainty in matters of eternal moment; and any system of religion, or any ecclesiasticism, that fails to satisfy the mind of man upon this vital point, is altogether unsuited to the dearest necessity of his being, and can not long claim his allegiance. The Christian religion, we have been taught, is adapted to man *as he is*. If this be true—and we do not presume to gainsay it—then Christianity must, in a large sense, respect the natural impulses of the heart. It seeks not to benumb the faculties with hard and unnatural doctrines; and because the framers of human creeds have either forgotten or ignored this fact, we find that many of the most cherished dogmas of the various schools of theology are permitted to drop into oblivion without a tear or regret. Christianity forces not the native stream into an alien channel. It takes cognizance of man just as it finds him. It appeals to his holiest and tenderest sympathies. It is its province to guide, to educate, to gently restrain, in their appointed courses, what are commonly called the *natural* tendencies of man's deathless spirit.

A profound mystery enshrouds this being of ours. Brought into this mortal state without any volition of our own—mortal, however, as it respects the physical nature of man only; immortal as it respects what we denominate his higher, or spiritual nature—we find ourselves hurried along by an irresistible tide, and with the speed of the lightning's wing, to whatever doom may await us in the realm beyond the river of death. Orphaned, inexperienced, ignorant—we long to lay hold upon some mighty hand that can deliver us. We long to cast our eternal fortunes upon something in which we may safely and confidently trust.

Who has not experienced feelings akin to these? Who, amidst

all the doubt and uncertainty with which this life is environed, has not cried, "O, that I knew where I might find him! that I might come even to his seat! I would order my cause before him, and fill my mouth with arguments. I would know the words which he would answer me, and understand what he would say unto me."

A distinguished literary man has said that the most priceless treasure in the universe is an unflinching religious belief. No matter whether the object of the man's faith be worthy or unworthy; given, that he believes in his religious system with all his heart, then must he necessarily be a happy man; for, in such a case, the highest possible demand of his spiritual nature has been met, and fully satisfied. "And therefore," said this philosopher, "I would rather have such a simple and unquestioning faith than to be the ruler of an empire." This man was right. A little will suffice for the bodily wants; a little bread, a little raiment, a shelter from the storm, and the body will do well enough. But not so the spirit. There is a spirit dwelling in this body that is not so easily satisfied; its clamorous tongue can not be so easily silenced. It demands something that we, of ourselves, have not to give. It drives us far beyond the range and scope of our own limited resources. But for this spirit, man would lie down with the quietness and apathy of the dull ox.

At this precise point our spiritual throes begin. The spirit demands that which is as infallible as God himself; it seeks a foundation as enduring as the throne of Jehovah. But all that we see around us is fallible and evanescent—as fallible, indeed, as man is weak; as evanescent as his earthly glory. In the beginning of the dispensation of grace, this question, in its general bearings, was better understood than it now is. The Jews had witnessed the decadence of the grandest monarchy on earth, and the desecration of a temple that was, at one period of their eventful history, the glory of the whole world. Groaning, as they were, under political bondage, imposed by a foreign despot, and cut up, as they were, into numerous fiercely conflicting sects in their religion, they had beheld the removal of almost every landmark of their ancient greatness and splendor. They were the victims of unrest and instability, and, but for their religious education, they, too, would, in the very streets of Jerusalem, have erected an altar to the unknown God. They had measurably lost faith in their religion, and had come to regard the



story of their former national prestige as a bitter jest or horrid mockery. Vague ideas, indeed, of a Deliverer, of a Restorer, floated among them, but scarcely made an impression upon the popular mind. That the throne and kingdom of the royal David would be reëstablished and perpetuated, they had a dim notion. National stability, religious confidence—these were the blessings for which their eager hearts most longingly panted. Accordingly, one of the very first lessons taught them by the successor of David was, that in him they should find *rest*—but rest for their *souls*. The question as to the possible perpetuity of earthly kingdoms had been settled—settled forever. These are but the glittering baubles of time—the splendid visions of dreamers. The soul needs something more than the gilded pageantry of earthly courts. “In the world you shall have tribulation,” was one of his lessons, “but in me you shall have peace. My Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, and my government shall never be destroyed. Of its increase there shall be no end, and the stone cut out of the mountain without hands shall finally fill the world.” Such were the hopes held out to his disciples by the Great Teacher. The people had known only of earthly kingdoms, but he spoke only of the heavenly Kingdom. It was, hence, in harmony with the teachings of the Master that the Apostle Paul said to the converted Hebrews, many years subsequently, “We have received a kingdom that can not be moved.” Such a kingdom, then, the Lord Jesus Christ came to found. Its subjects were to be gathered from the kingdoms of this world, and as to their actual citizenship there was to be no more doubt than of the existence of God himself. This world, indeed, was to be its territory—its battle-ground—the scene alike of its conflicts and victories. Laws were to be promulged, rewards promised to the obedient, and threatenings of wrath denounced against every enemy of this new but everlasting Kingdom.

But will this new monarchy succeed? Is there any reasonable doubt of its final and certain triumph? As the shortest way to answer these questions, another shall be propounded, namely: *Are all the conditions of success found to inhere in the founder of this Kingdom?* Did he undertake that which he is unable to accomplish? These are vital and fundamental questions. This, indeed, is the pivotal point upon which the whole question of the stability and perpetuity of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ turns.



Laws do but reflect the virtues and the vices of those for whom they are made. In this, no more than in any thing else, can the stream rise above its fountain. And the same thing is true of the ruler personally. If there remain any opposing force which he can not conquer, then he may himself be conquered. If there be any power which he can not control, then by it he may himself be controlled. Apply these tests to Jesus Christ as his *character*, and the *nature of his Kingdom* are portrayed in the Bible, and we have no difficulty in determining the question, Are all the conditions of success found to inhere in the Founder of the heavenly Kingdom? We find, indeed, every condition of success fulfilled in him by which it is possible for finite intelligence to judge. Virtue, wisdom, power, authority—these are the conditions of the success of any enterprise of moment.

It is now too late in the history of the world to raise any question as to the virtue, wisdom, power, or authority of Jesus. Still, in this place, we shall give it one moment's attention. He was, here upon the earth, the very incarnation of virtue; in him dwelt then all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge; there is absolutely *no* power that he can not control; and all authority in heaven and on earth is given into his hands. Cæsar performed prodigies of valor; he adorned his august brow with the crown of an emperor; he passed into the darkness of the grave; but from the darkness of that grave great Cæsar has never yet emerged. All his thundering and victorious legions could not break the spell of death. Death at last proved the mightier of the two.

“But yesterday the word of Cæsar might  
Have stood against the world; now lies he there,  
And none so poor to do him reverence.”

But from the contemplation of Cæsar turn we to Jesus of Nazareth. He had no earthly prestige; he had no Senate to frame laws for him; he had no armed hosts to execute his decrees; he had no royal patronage to dispense. But he did many mighty deeds; he wore a crown, but it was a crown of thorns; he, too, passed into the silence of the tomb, but death had no power to hold him there. Cæsar's subjects are not to be found among all the kingdoms of men, but the followers of Jesus are numbered by millions.

Time, too, tests the strength of the foundations of empires; but time—if we may so speak—has only consolidated and established the throne of the Prince Messiah. Perpetuity, stability, confidence—these were to be the distinguishing features of the Kingdom of heaven; and these ideas had a conspicuous place in the teaching of Jesus Christ and the prime ministers of his Kingdom. First demonstrating his own absolute immortality, his final word of parting was, “I am with you all the days, even to the end of the age.”

He was the Stone of prophecy, the Stone rejected by the Jewish builders, the Stone that was to become the head of the corner. The fundamental principle, the vital truth of his empire, the truth comprehending all truth of Divine revelation, was succinctly stated in a single proposition—JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD. “*On this Rock,*” he said, “*I will build my Church, and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it.*” This, then, is the foundation truth of the Christian religion; this is the Rock upon which the vast superstructure of Christianity rests. Destroy this foundation, establish the fact that Jesus of Nazareth in Galilee is not the Christ, that he is not Divine, and we would not give a farthing for all the Churches in the world, or for the hopes of humanity beyond the grave. His confession expresses simply and concisely the infallible truth of the Infinite God. A Church, therefore, built upon *this* truth—a Church which adopts this truth as its creed—a Church whose practical life is in strict conformity to this truth—a Church, in brief, which in its organization is found to be in perfect harmony with this truth as practically developed in the ministry of the apostles, *is an infallible Church*. But no other Church is. Such a Church, and such a Church only, is infallible in its foundation, infallible in its creed, infallible in its organization, and infallible in its ideas of practical Church life. It is the truth, then, that makes the Church infallible. Is this proposition true? Pause over it—pause over it long if you will—before you reply, for upon the truth or falsity of this proposition depends the religious problem of the age. This is *the* issue now before the religious world. Happy the man who is ready and eager to enter the lists upon the right side. If this proposition be true, then it is a tremendous truth, involving tremendous consequences; but if it be false, then all Protestantism is a lie and a cheat, and only Rome is true. The religious problem

which demands solution of this age is, An infallible Church, or an infallible Book—which? Rome, for herself, has long since answered this question; it remains for Protestantism to answer it in an equally decisive and practical manner. This Protestantism, as the sequel will show, has never really done. The issue has, indeed, long been made up; only that part of the religious world called Protestant has not been quite ready for it. But now this question is fast becoming clamorous for a solution, and it will not be hushed even with the most specious sophistry. It demands to be tried upon its merits, and loudly inquires why judgment should not now be rendered, and the verdict be recorded upon the sober page of history. Are we ready for the trial?

Rome, always crafty, always wise in the wisdom of this world, always ready in most things to accommodate herself to countries, times, and men's manners, early recognized the fundamental truth, *that it is inherent in man's nature to demand infallibility in the matter of his religion*. Give him perfect confidence in his religious position; imbue him with the idea that his hope is well-founded; in a word, invest him with the clear and well-defined conviction that his religious faith, in whatever it may consist, or whatever may be its object, is infallible, and you bind him as in fetters of iron. A man morally and intellectually well-balanced, demands something in which he can infallibly trust; you can never satisfy him else. Nor is he to be blamed for this; it is but a reasonable demand of his spiritual nature. Rome, it is repeated, early recognized this most important fact; and in laying the foundations of that stupendous hierarchy, which is to-day both the wonder and the shame of the religious world, she had to choose between two alternatives. She reasoned somewhat after this fashion: Our adherents must be profoundly penetrated with the conviction that they are *secure*. We must give them confidence, permanence, infallibility; but *in what* shall this infallibility consist? This was the question that Rome had to meet more than twelve centuries ago; and wisely, as this world calls wisdom, did she meet it. *She gave to her people an infallible Church*. As between an infallible Church, or an infallible Book, she gave her people the former; and to this idea she most tenaciously adheres to this day. This is, in truth, the central, the fundamental, idea of Popery. Around this idea Romanism has gathered all her forces; around

this idea she has crystallized—solidified, so to speak—until she has become what we now see her to be. This idea of ecclesiastical infallibility is at once the secret of her success, her unity, and her power. Strike from Roman Catholicism this foundation doctrine of the Church's infallibility, and in that same moment, and by that same blow, you shall see the proud fabric crumble into dust! Every act, every subordinate article of faith, every pontifical edict, every synodical ordinance of Rome is in harmony with this controlling idea. And I conclude that he who has not so read her history has not read it aright. The Church is infallible; the Church can do no wrong; the Church can not err; these are the ligaments that even the sharp sword of war has no power to cut.

The unity of Rome, then, is the unity of a gigantic ecclesiasticism founded upon the central idea of the Church's infallibility. To preserve this idea intact, every thing else would be ruthlessly sacrificed. To preserve this idea intact, Rome will bend, will break, will concede, until all her characteristic features are changed. It is a well-known fact, susceptible of ocular demonstration, that the Romanism of France is not identical with that of Italy, except in this one particular. In this you shall find identity. However widely they differ in other matters, they are agreed in this; and *this* is the unity of which Rome so proudly boasts. It is, furthermore, well known that the Roman Catholic Church in the United States is scarcely recognizable as the Roman Catholic Church in Spain, except in this, that in both countries alike they cling with the gripe of death to the doctrine of ecclesiastical infallibility. Austria may fling away the Concordat, and utterly disregard the most solemn obligations, but still the Church in Austria is bound to the chair of Saint Peter by the one bond of infallibility. France, and Austria, and Italy—all Roman Catholic powers—may be involved in most awful and sanguinary strife; thrones may be vacated, dynasties changed, crowns crumbled, and scepters broken, but still, in an ecclesiastical sense, all are held together by the strong tie of Church infallibility. The unity of Rome, then, is not the unity of the Spirit, nor is the bond that binds its several parts together the bond of peace; and it is not hence *such* a union as we desire to see obtain among the true Israel of God. But it has served the purpose for which it was designed. It has made monarchs, in abject humility, hold the stirrup while their

spiritual master mounted; and it has made other monarchs bare their necks to the pressure of the pontifical foot. It has made Rome the mightiest ecclesiasticism of earth. It binds millions in chains that may not be broken; and Protestantism might just as well shoot harmless arrows at the thunderbolts of Jove, hoping thereby to silence them, as to try to break the power of Rome without first dispossessing her adherents of the idea of the Church's infallibility. In this they most devoutly believe, and, believing it, they are as immovable as the everlasting hills. Indeed, they would be simpletons were they to yield their positions in what they believe to be an infallible Church, for the unsettled, half-hearted, broken, disjointed Protestantism of the nineteenth century. We, too, must give them something infallible. We do not desire to destroy the *idea* of infallibility, nor to remove it from their minds; but we do most ardently desire to give them *the true theory of infallibility*. It is not the *idea* of infallibility, but the *object* that we wish to change.

But where shall we find that for which we seek? Shall we find it among the contending sects of the Protestant world? Protestants indeed have the Book, but they understand not its value. They do not, in their various sects, illustrate the divine idea of unity as it respects the one Body; nor do they, if we may judge from the multiplication of human creeds, exhibit much confidence in what is popularly supposed to be, *par excellence*, the Protestant creed. The truth is, that the Bible is no more the exclusive creed of Protestantism than it is of Romanism. Both alike cling to the traditions of the "Fathers," and both alike trust to the *ex-cathedra* interpretation of uninspired men. Let the various Protestant sects of the day eliminate all that is human from their creeds, and conform their practice to the apostolic Churches, and were their respective founders to rise from the dead they would not recognize the children of their care.

The apostles had a standard by which they tried all men. The Gospel, the Church, the Ordinance, meant something. They had but one Gospel to preach. Belief in that Gospel, and obedience to its requirements, constituted men Christians. And these Christians constituted the one Body. Now, did the apostles ever promise salvation to men who refused to yield to its terms as contained in the Commission under whose sanctions they preached? Did they, in one word, ever promise salvation to any human being outside of *the*

*Church* of which they themselves were members? I most solemnly affirm that they never did! To the truth as they preached it; to the ordinances as they administered them; and to the Church, as they, by the Holy Spirit's aid, organized it, *they have bound the world!* Now apply these apostolic tests to the Protestant parties of the age.

Here are ten Protestant priests, representing ten Protestant factions. I approach the first. "Can I, sir, be saved, and not be a member of your Church, and without rendering obedience to the Gospel *as you preach it?*" He replies, "O, yes; I would not be so uncharitable as to say that you can not be saved in some *other* Church." Imagine an apostle of Jesus Christ employing this form of speech! Poor, deluded man! I presume that when, with a self-satisfied air, he has said this, he thinks that he has done charity a real service, whereas he has but strangled her in the house of her professed friends. This man represents a miserable faction called a church, outside the pale of which he confesses men can be saved. And so I address myself to each of the ten Protestant priests, and from each I receive the same answer. Each refers me to some other mythical establishment, in which salvation may be found. To be sure, it is to be found in *his* Church; but then it may also be obtained in some other Church radically different from his own! "Well," I again inquire, "is your Church infallible?" About all that he knows of the Roman Catholic Church is, that it claims to be infallible, and he must not be like a Roman Catholic in any thing, else he would not be a good Protestant; therefore he answers me readily, "No, sir; my Church is not infallible. It is made up of poor, sinful, erring men." I push my inquiries: "Is your *creed* infallible?" At a loss to know to which of his creeds I refer—the human or the divine—and remembering that Chillingworth once proclaimed that "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants," he determines, on this occasion at least, to select the Bible, and so he responds, "The Gospel is necessary, though of itself insufficient, to renew and sanctify the depraved hearts of men. The Gospel is necessary, though alone it can not purify man. The truths of revelation are not sufficient to save men. The Word of God, without the accompanying influence of the Holy Spirit, which is distinct from it, and operates independently of it, has no power to save.

Without this abstract influence of the Holy Spirit, the Word of God is a dead letter.”\*

And thus does Protestantism bow her head to the dust, and from her all hope departs. It is weaker than Romanism in this, that while Rome utterly repudiates the doctrine of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, it tenaciously holds to the dogma of the Church's infallibility. The Church, at least, is sufficient and infallible. You may safely, and forever, trust in the Church. But the Protestant has neither an infallible Church, nor, in his judgment, an infallible Book. True, his creed may direct him in what it is right for him to do, but then he can not control his own volitions; and though he may *believe* right, still, in order to make his faith worth any thing, he must await the accompanying influence of an abstract agent, which he can not control. And herein we perceive the weakness of Protestantism. The Protestant can not implicitly trust his Church; it speaks not to him in tones calculated to beget confidence; and as for his creed—why, that is all well enough as an abstract question, but then he does not know how *far* to trust it, or how *much* to trust it. As for the momentous questions, “Am I saved *now*? Am I *infallibly* right, both in my faith and practice?” it is enough to say that he despairs of their being satisfactorily answered in this life. A life lived in harmony with *moral law* is the best evidence—and in a myriad of cases the only evidence—the Protestant has that he is a pardoned man. He hence lives in constant uncertainty and doubt, and eternally oscillates between hope and fear. There is no comfort in any such religion as this, and I marvel not, therefore, that thousands of persons of Protestant birth and culture incontinently throw themselves upon the soothing breast of “Holy Mother Church.” She is, indeed, to such as believe in her, a cherishing mother. She says: “Come to my bosom, my children; in my embrace you shall find rest. I will care for you; I will nurse you; I will lead you infallibly right; you need never fear so long as you are true to your mother.” Is it wonderful, then, that the potent spell of her witcheries binds millions to her heart? To my mind it is inconceivable how it could be otherwise.

Now, ask one of these same Papists if there is salvation outside the pale of his Church, and, if he be honest, he will startle you with

\* These answers are written as given by a distinguished Presbyterian divine.



his deep and sonorous "No!" And I honor him for his answer. I honor any man who is thus rational and consistent, be he Roman Catholic, Pagan, or Protestant. Of one who is simply and only a Christian we expect no other answer.

"But," I said to a Papist only the other day, "you say that the Bible is not sufficient as a rule both of faith and practice; how do you supply the deficiency?" For the answer I was, of course, prepared: "We supply the deficiency with tradition." "Some one," I returned, "must determine as to the credibility and consequent value of tradition." "O, yes," enthusiastically exclaimed my friend, "Holy Mother Church will attend to that! Her judgment is infallible; she can not go astray!" "You believe this," said I. "Believe it! with all the energy of my soul!"

I should like to see a Protestant priest, with his six hundred and odd sects, and his six hundred and odd creeds in addition to the Bible, and *no* infallible Church to determine the good from the evil—I say that I should like to see such a priest undertake the "conversion" of such a devotee! Will he succeed? Yes; when the Ethiopian can change his skin, and the leopard his spots!

From my quiet office, in the heart of this great city, in which I write, I look out upon scores of vast temples, whose spires, piercing the blue heavens, are surmounted with the symbol of the Christian faith. I lay down my pen, and take a stroll. I reflect: It is possible that I am overworked, and nervous, and feverish, and may have drawn somewhat upon my imagination. I pass whole squares—squares in the most attractive and beautiful districts in the city—walled in with solid granite, inclosing vast piles consecrated to schools, nunneries, hospitals, monasteries, etc. Into these hives of human bees, old and young—but especially the young—rich and poor, high and low, black and white, foreigner and native, ignorant and learned, are swarming in countless numbers. Interminable processions of ecclesiastically-uniformed men and women, boys and girls, are constantly marching and countermarching upon the streets. The stately and measured tread of these serried ranks would not suffer in comparison with the trained movements of veteran warriors. Here are numbers, wealth, influence, social power—every thing that can give *éclat* to any organization. I gaze upon the imposing spectacle until I grow dizzy, and then I look down upon the shattered, broken,



contending sects of Protestantism, that lie almost helpless and impotent at the feet of this huge spiritual hierarchy, and I ask myself the question: "Why this amazing, this appalling disparity?" I find the answer in one word, and that word is—*infallibility*!

There is discipline here, there is tact here, there is craft here, there is spiritual despotism here; but, above all, in the unalterable belief of each one of this great army of souls, there is infallibility here! Like the spinal cord, this fact vitalizes, energizes, and holds the whole body erect; cut that cord, and helpless paralysis will supervene. The intense devotion to "mother Church," exhibited in the lives of her heterogeneous family, is easily explained on the ground of their unwavering confidence in her infallibility. I have called her family heterogeneous: heterogeneous they may be in all things else—homogeneous in this. Their mother offers them an asylum which they are fain to enter; she sings to them her sweetest lullaby; she hushes the sobs of her babes; she has the means of restoring confidence where confidence is wanting. Is "poor Carlotta" driven from her realm by a savage mob? She flies to the altars of the Church. Is Isabella hurled from her throne by an outraged and suffering people? She hastens to the shelter of the Church. Kings, potentates, beggars—all, all have this last resort. She takes unquestioned charge of the souls of her children while living, and gives their bodies no common sepulture when dead. And thus has it been from the beginning.

But with all the earnestness of which my nature is susceptible do I repudiate the claims and pretensions of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. True, infallibility we must have somewhere, but I deny the pretended infallibility of Rome. It resides not in what I solemnly believe to be the "mystery of iniquity." The infallibility of Rome is a splendid lie—a gorgeous delusion. Nor shall we find the true idea of infallibility among the Protestant sects of the day, with the use that they make of the Bible. What, then, would I do? This I would do: I would emphasize, with the vehemence of fire, the necessity of infallibility, but I would seek for that infallibility elsewhere than in Rome, Geneva, or Oxford. I would seek for it—and *I should find it*—in the Bible, and the Bible ALONE! I would, with the voice of thunder, proclaim to all the world, "The Word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith

which we preach—that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God has raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For, with the heart, man believeth unto righteousness; and, with the mouth, confession is made unto salvation. . . . For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How, then, shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent? . . . So, then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.” Here is my charter, here my credentials. I would substitute the Bible for the ecclesiastical unity of Rome on the one hand, and broken, divided, spiritless Protestantism on the other. I would place the Bible first—I would place the Bible *above* all Churches. I would make it the supreme and only arbiter in things spiritual. I would place the Bible *before* all Churches. I would make the Bible, to every soul of our race, *what the Church is to the Papist*. I would supplant the Churches of men’s creation with the revealed will of the eternal Jehovah. I would intrench humanity behind the Bible. I would make the Bible their bulwark and their defense, their covert from the storm, their garden of delight amidst the sterility of ecclesiastical deserts. I would say to mankind: The Bible is before all Churches. The Bible was *first*, then THE CHURCH followed. *Without the former the latter would have no existence.* Human oracles there may be, *but they are without AUTHORITY.* The fundamental—the central—truth of the Bible is the rock upon which the Church is built. The foundation had *first to be laid* before the superstructure called the Church could be built upon it. The central truth of the Christian system existed, and had been confessed by human lips, long before the institution—the only institution—that Jesus Christ ever recognized as HIS CHURCH, had any organized existence. And this truth was committed to men immediately from the lips of Jehovah! “Flesh and blood has not revealed this to you.” The Church, then, is the light-bearer, the servant of the infallible truth. The Church is infallible only when it exists in perfect conformity to the truth. Only as it is built upon the truth, and molded in all respects after the Divine model, and animated by the very spirit that made known the truth, is the Church infallible. It will be safe to trust what men call the

Church just so far as it proves faithful to the truth, but no further. The Church is nothing to me when, either in its inception, its organization, its faith, or its practice, it deviates from the plain law of Christ. It is, to me then, a Church only in name. I can have, in such a case, no respect for its authority, no confidence in its pretensions, and no reverence for its history. It is nothing more to me than any other human institution containing, it may be, a certain per centum of diluted truth. That is all. But for the Church established upon the truth, and supported by the truth—such a Church, for example, as that whose history is recorded in the Acts of Apostles, and which began in Jerusalem—I have respect, I have reverence, and in it I have the profoundest confidence. And if you ask me, "Is there salvation outside the pale of *this* Church?" I hesitate not to answer—I blush not to answer—"No!"

This Church is not a sect among sects; it is not a denomination among denominations; it is not to be—it can not be—measured by human standards. Its origin, its foundation, its laws, its ordinances, its very name, are all divine. The seal and authority of Almighty God are upon them all. Such a Church *is* infallible, but only then because the truth has made it so. There is no human manipulating, no bartering, no exchanging, no selling of birthrights in such a Church. What the truth of God binds is bound; what his truth makes free is free indeed.

Do you, as a Protestant, marvel at the devotion of that poor, ignorant Papist? Do you wonder that that servant girl will rise from her hard bed at four o'clock of a cold winter morning, and seek her confessional before you think of leaving your luxurious couch? Do you wonder that, out of the scanty wages paid by you and your class to this same servant girl, arise those magnificent cathedrals, churches, colleges, hospitals, asylums—all over the land? Marvel not. It is because this girl *believes* in what she is doing. She was taught it by her peasant-mother before her. She believes in the infallibility of her Church; she believes that her Church has power to save her; and believing, *she shows her faith by her works*. Chide not this girl until you are able to show her a more excellent way. When you make the Bible take the place in your heart that the Church has taken in the heart of this poor girl; when you teach your children to trust in and reverence the Word of God, as this

girl's mother taught her to trust in and reverence the Church ; when you teach yourself and teach your children to believe that the salvation of this lost and ruined world depends upon the reception of the truth as it is in Jesus ; then, but not till then, will there be a corresponding effort on your part to show *your* faith by *your* works. This girl shall then find a powerful rival in her mistress !

Finally. What is your child doing in that Papal school ? Would the Papist send *his* child to *your* school ? He would sooner see it immolated upon an altar of fire ! And in this, according to his faith, he acts wisely. I commend his wisdom as worthy your Protestant consideration and imitation ! The Papist manages to induce all his children to go with him. Do you enjoy a corresponding influence over *your* children ? Is your family a united family, as is the family of the Papist ? These are momentous questions for the Protestant of this day to solve, but solved they must be.

Are you able to feel the sting in the following words of "Pius, Sovereign Pontiff, Ninth of the Name, to all Protestants and non-Catholics ?" In speaking of the multitudinous sects of the Protestant world, and of the restlessness, instability, and uncertainty that every-where characterizes Protestantism, he says :

"Every one can easily comprehend that this state of things is altogether opposed to the Church established by Christ our Lord, a Church in which the truth must always rest unaltered, without being the subject of any change, as a charge intrusted to the same Church in order that she may preserve it in all its integrity, a charge for the care of which the presence of the Holy Ghost, and its aid, has been granted forever to this Church. No one can ignore the fact that these differences of doctrine and opinion give rise to the social schisms, and that therefrom spring these innumerable sects and communions which are daily increasing, to the detriment of Christian and civil society. Whoever, in fact, recognizes religion as the foundation of human society can not refuse to admit and avow the influence exercised over civilized society by those divisions, and disagreements of principles of that nature, and of religious societies, struggling one with the other ; and also with what power and denial of authority established by God to regulate the conviction of the human intelligence, and to direct the actions of men, both in their social and private life, has excited, has developed, and has fomented those most unfortunate troubles, those events, and those disturbances which agitate and affect almost all nations in a most deplorable manner."

The very fact that the Pope of Rome should, in the last half of the nineteenth century, have occasion to pen such a paragraph, ought to call the blush of shame to every Protestant cheek ! Protestantism has been experimenting for three hundred years, and the Pope of

Rome has summed up the result! Let Protestantism try the force of its logic upon this Papal dilemma!

In Christ's dear name, let us have done with our sectarian and party strife! If we really believe in the Bible, then let us take the Bible. Let us give it its true position. Let us place the Bible above every thing else, and then, in *all things*, conform ourselves to its teaching. Let us throw away our human creeds; let us disband our schismatical religious societies; let us all henceforth speak the same things; and let divisions cease among us forever! Let us confidently and wholly rely upon the infallible truth of God's Word. This can not err; this can not mislead us; this will never deceive us. Its accents fall with amazing power upon men's hearts. The calm precision of its statements is truly wonderful. More unhesitating in its utterances than the Delphic Oracle, its every word is clothed with the majesty and authority of the living God!

## IV.—RELIGION AND SCIENCE.

IN the wide domain of the universe there are no contradictions. Often we come upon what seem to be such, but they are only seeming—the fruit of our ignorance. More extended and careful research, leading to higher generalizations, always brings order out of chaos—thus illustrating the trite maxim, “*The exception proves the rule.*” The proposition needs no argument, and the man who demands it is the very one that is not satisfied when it is given. The thought enters into the very conception of a God. Revelation says, the universe is one; so does Science. In the words of Scripture, “*God is not the author of confusion, but of peace.*”

Accordingly, the spiritual and natural worlds can not antagonize. Both are of God. Neither can the Scriptures and Science, provided the former be a genuine religious voice, and the latter a true interpretation of nature. Terms are here used in their absolute sense. Reference is not made to the exegesis of any particular sect, or to the theories of any particular school, but to the thought of God expressed in revelation and in creation. If the thoughts of the Bible and the thoughts of nature are God's thoughts, then there can be no antagonisms. St. Augustine stated the Christian hypothesis thus: “*Duo sunt que in cognitionem Dei ducunt, Creatura et Scriptura*—There are two which lead to a knowledge of God, Creation and the Scriptures.” Nature and the Bible are respectively the older and the younger Scriptures; they are two Testaments by the same author. The pages of both are divine, because they are traced by the same Divine hand. The Christian hypothesis is a proper subject of investigation, but, in the present discussion, it is not to be called in question.

Thus far there is no difficulty; but so soon as we pass beyond the absolute into the realm of Biblical interpretation and scientific theory, what a strife! What a babel of discordant voices! However it may be with other fields of mental activity, men of religion and men of science are not at peace. It is our purpose to inquire into some of the causes of this strife—to explain why confusion has

usurped the seat of order—to show why discord reigns instead of concord—to account for contradiction in the place of harmony. The point of departure already indicated is that, absolutely, there is no antagonism.

We shall first state the principal condition of peace between men of faith and men of science. Faith has a distinct province, and so has reason; Religion has a realm in the universe, and so has Science. This being agreed to, the boundary line between the two provinces must be drawn with at least *tolerable distinctness*. Furthermore, when drawn, this line must be respected. Neither the theologian nor the philosopher must assert a claim to the whole spiritual empire. The theologian must not invade, with his method of thought, the kingdom of the sciences, nor must the philosopher make incursions with his into the kingdom of grace. The one must yield ample room for scientific inquiry; the other must leave some space for faith. Each must acknowledge that there is more than one kind of knowledge. Man must be left with both a Religion and a Science,\* otherwise, his spiritual equipment will be incomplete. We hope to make the truth of all these propositions appear as we proceed.

Those who know any thing of the past know there has been a hotly waged conflict between Religion and Science; those who keep abreast of the present, know that it still goes on, and that it loses none of its intensity. That this strife has resulted, and is constantly resulting disastrously to both Science and Religion, is believed by many who are entitled to an opinion. Now, if reason and faith have different though intimately related spheres, if we may rightfully have both a science and a religion, why should this be? Where does the responsibility rest? We do not conceal the fact that the collision grows, in part, out of the inherent difficulty of the subject; out of the difficulty of defining the limits of religious and scientific knowledge; out of the difficulty of determining where we should walk by faith, and where by sight. But this concession, even when pushed

\*“Science has a foundation, and so has Religion; let them unite their foundations, and the basis will be broader, and they will be two compartments of one great fabric, reared to the glory of God. Let the one be the outer and the other the inner court. In the one let all look, and admire, and adore; and in the other, let those who have faith kneel and pray, and praise. Let the one be the sanctuary where human learning may present its richest incense as an offering to God; and the other, the holiest of all, separated from it by a vail now rent in twain, and in which, on a blood-sprinkled mercy-seat, we pour out the love of a reconciled heart, and hear the oracles of the living God.”—*M’Cosh*.



to the farthest extreme, does not account for the imbittered feeling that has attended the great debate, or for the contrariety of opinion. There is a personal responsibility; and this we charge in about equal measure upon the theologians and the philosophers. The former are too fearful, jealous, and bigoted; the latter, too pretentious and arrogant. The former have sought to restrict, unduly, the range of scientific investigation—ceaselessly crying out, Hands off! The latter have ignored the religious nature of man, and have sought to annihilate faith. The theologian has trenched on the field of science; the scientist has denied that there is more than one kind of knowledge. The former has sought to cover the universe with his texts; the latter with his natural laws. Thus neither party has respected the primal condition of fraternity.

Of course many great names can be mentioned that are exceptions to these broad generalizations—names of theologians, characterized by an ardent love of science rather than by the *odium theologicum*; names of philosophers, characterized by a deep and beautiful faith in religion rather than by pride of opinion. But these honorable exceptions do not atone for the errors of their respective classes. For some centuries, unless we read history amiss, the theological spirit and the scientific spirit have been opposed to each other. To sustain this position, we shall pass in review some of the more interesting and important facts touching the controversy. As we write in a Christian magazine, we shall be careful that the champion of the faith does not go unwhipped of justice.

1. *Astronomy*.—Along with her other legacies, Pagan antiquity bequeathed to the Christian Church a science of the stars. This science was almost wholly the creation of a few great minds, who were trained in the schools of Alexandria, and who, in turn, reflected upon those schools the splendor of their own achievements. It was the matured fruit of many generations' observation and thought. Of all the great scientific names that adorn the history of the Grecian capital of Egypt, perhaps the greatest is that of Ptolemy, the astronomer and geographer, who lived in the second century. He is known to the astronomical science of to-day as the author of two great discoveries—that of the moon's evection, and that of the planetary motions—but from his own day to the seventeenth century he was the honored author of the received science of Astronomy. It

was Ptolemy who organized into a theory the discoveries of the Alexandrian astronomers. Thus, for sixteen hundred years, he stood before the world the author of a great system; and the authors of great systems, let it be remembered, are ever stars of the first magnitude in the intellectual horizon. Ptolemy's great work, called, in Greek, "The Syntaxis," was known to the Arabian philosophers as "The Almagest;" and this was the name that passed with the work to Christian Europe. The central doctrine of the Ptolemaic astronomy was this: The earth is fixed in space, while the sun and the planets revolve around it. This theory—now called *geocentric*, because it makes the earth (*gee*) the center of the system—was warmly embraced by the Church of the middle ages. The reasons are obvious: 1. It was held by the best intellects of Europe; 2. It appeared to harmonize with the language of the Scriptures; 3. It was flattering to theological pride of opinion. Accordingly, the Aristotelian Church doctors regarded the "Almagest" in the light of an authoritative commentary on the Bible. To them the earth was the center of the solar system as certainly as Christ was the center of the Christian system, or as certainly as the Pope was the successor of St. Peter. The theory was not held as a doctrine of science, to be abandoned if the progress of discovery should demand it, but as an article of religious faith, worthy of all acceptance. There were some individuals who did not thus regard it, but they were the exceptions. To this day the infallible Latin Church stands committed, on the pages of history, to Ptolemy. One of the inconveniences of an infallible body is that it can never modify or retract its decisions; an inconvenience that the more enlightened Catholics must sometimes feel.

Having sufficiently characterized the received Astronomy at the time of the great intellectual awakening that ushered in the Modern Era, and having stated the position of the Church with respect to it, we must next trace the steps by which the mind of Europe emancipated itself from this venerable error, and point out the course the Church pursued with reference to that emancipation. We note the fact that with the introduction of the Modern Era begins the long and acrimonious struggle which we so deeply deplore.

Nicholas Copernicus was born in the City of Thorn, Poland, in 1473. He was the man who overthrew the geocentric astronomy. He was by profession a priest. In his early life he studied medicine

and mathematics; subsequently he applied himself to the study of the heavens. He was soon struck with the great and increasing complexity of the Ptolemaic system, and as early as 1507 came to the conclusion that nature follows simple laws. Copernicus had, in a marked degree, one of the characteristics of the great natural philosopher: he was patient and indefatigable. He reviewed every known system of Astronomy, and finally adopted the *heliocentric* theory—that which makes the sun (*helios*) the center of the planetary system. It was not until he had spent more than thirty years in observation and reflection that he consented to publish the work in which his views were developed—a fact that contains a salutary lesson for hasty theorizers. His *De Revolutionibus Orbium Cælestium* was published in 1543; its author received the first printed copy on his death-bed but a few hours before he breathed his last. A monument to his memory with an inscription taken from the Latin version of the Book of Joshua, “STA, SOL, NE MOVEARE,” stands in the city of Cracow.

The extreme humility of this great mind in stating the discoveries that have immortalized his name is proof of the low estimation in which science was held in his generation; it is proof, as well, of the far-reaching influence of the hierarchy. He said, in his preface:

“Then I too began to meditate on the motions of the earth, and, though it appeared an absurd opinion, yet, since I knew that in previous times others had been allowed the privilege of feigning what circle they chose in order to explain the phenomena, I concluded that I might take the liberty of trying whether, on the supposition of the earth's motion, it was possible to find better explanations than the ancient ones of the revolutions of the celestial orbs. . . . Though I know that the thoughts of a philosopher do not depend on the judgment of the many, his study being to seek out truth in all things as far as is permitted by God to human reason, yet, when I considered how absurd my doctrines would appear, I long hesitated whether I should publish my book, or whether it were not better to follow the example of Pythagoras and others, who delivered their doctrines only by tradition and to friends.”

This is the pass to which things come when the Church assumes to be an authoritative expounder of philosophy. But Copernicus concluded his preface in a worthier strain:

“If there be vain babblers, who, knowing nothing of mathematics, yet assumed the right of judging on account of some place in Scripture perversely wrested to their purpose, and who blame and attack my undertaking, I heed them not, and look upon their judgment as rash and contemptible.”

As we have implied, the Polish philosopher did not live to witness the strife that his work created. The heliocentric theory did not at once meet defiant opposition. Copernicus was a Catholic and a priest; he even dedicated the *De Revolutionibus* to the Pope. But so soon as it began to attract attention the thunders of the Church were let loose. Giordano Bruno, author of a work on the Plurality of Worlds, contributed largely to its introduction into England. But Bruno was a heretic as well as a man of science. The Inquisition pursued him with insatiable malignity, and as much because he was a disciple of Copernicus as because he disbelieved the doctrine of transubstantiation. Falling at length into the hands of his priestly enemies, he was handed over to the civil authorities, to be punished "as mercifully as possible, and without the shedding of blood"—the hypocritical formula with which the Holy Inquisition sent men to the stake. Bruno was burned at Rome, in 1600. As sentence was pronounced upon him, he said: "Perhaps it is with greater fear that ye pass this sentence upon me than I receive it." We are indebted to this deistical philosopher for the invaluable thought that the Scriptures were not intended to teach science, *but morals only*.

But the heliocentric astronomy continued to gain ground on all sides. Its great expounders\* in the seventeenth century were Galileo, Kepler, Newton, and Milton—the three former in great scientific treatises, the latter in a great epic poem. We must now notice the conflict of Galileo with the hierarchy.

Galileo was born in Pisa, Italy, in 1564; he adopted the Copernican theory in the last decade of the sixteenth century. The pressure of public opinion may be inferred from the fact that even he, chivalrous as he was, for some years concealed (as he confesses in a letter to Kepler) his opinions. But early in the next century we find him publicly committed to the new doctrine. He constructed a telescope, and with it made the most surprising discoveries. These we can not so much as name, but they are written on the most

\* We regret that we can not add to these illustrious names that of Bacon. This philosopher spurned the heliocentric astronomy. He seems not to have sympathized with the real scientific work of his age. "He rejected the Copernican system, and spoke insolently of its great author; he undertook to criticise adversely Gilbert's treatise, 'De Magnete'; he was occupied in the condemnation of any investigation of final causes, while Harvey was deducing the circulation of the blood from Aquapendent's discovery of the valves in the veins; he was doubtful whether instruments were of any advantage while Galileo was investigating the heavens with the telescope."—*Draper*.

brilliant pages of the history of science. The Church was now thoroughly aroused. In 1616, Copernicus, although more than sixty years in his grave, was formally condemned as a heretic; the Inquisition pronounced his system "that false Pythagorean doctrine, utterly contrary to the Holy Scriptures." The works of Copernicus, of Galileo, of Kepler, were put on the *Index Expurgatorius*. Galileo was cited before the Holy Office. Remembering the fate of Bruno, he recanted, and promised to remain silent. But the truth within him again found a voice; in 1632 he published a new work, more obnoxious to the Church than any that had preceded it. Again he was cited before the Inquisition; again his spirit failed him;\* again he recanted. The aged and enfeebled philosopher, attired in a garment of disgrace, was compelled to fall on his knees before the assembled cardinals, and abjure the heliocentric doctrine; he was then committed to prison; those who had aided in printing his book were punished; his friends were publicly disgraced. After a short imprisonment he was permitted to go to Florence, but only to be confined in his own house, subject to continual indignities. In 1637 he lost his eyesight—shortly after, he became deaf. In his blindness he was visited by the young English Republican, John Milton, who, like Galileo, after performing the most substantial services for humanity, was, like him, to end his days in the midst of contumely and reproach, in sorrow and in darkness. Says an eloquent historian:

"He died, January, 1642, in the 78th year of his age, the prisoner of the Inquisition. True to its instincts, that infernal institution followed him beyond the grave, disputing his right to make a will, and denying him burial in consecrated ground. The Pope also prohibited his friends from raising to him a monument in the Church of Santa Croce, in Florence. It was reserved for the nineteenth century to erect a suitable memorial in his honor."

Again, we say, this is the pass to which we come when the Church, forgetting her own divinely-appointed mission, presumes to pronounce authoritatively on scientific questions. Galileo, like Bruno, had the clearness of vision to see that Religion and Science have different functions. He repeatedly declared that the Scriptures were not given as a scientific authority, but only for our salvation. This suggestive truth was afterwards treasured as it deserved to be.

\*There seems no sufficient evidence to prove that Galileo said, as he rose from his knees, "But still it moves."

We must now pay some attention to the weapons employed by the defenders of the geocentric astronomy. The pressure of public opinion, the rigors of the Inquisition, the anathemas of the Pope, have already been referred to; but it must not be supposed that the Church evoked only ecclesiastical thunders. Argument was resorted to. Let us form a distinct idea of the grounds on which Galileo was condemned. He was charged, 1. With holding that the sun is the center of the planetary system; he was charged, 2. With holding that the earth revolves around the sun, thus despising in both cases the teaching of the Bible. To disprove these propositions consumed the larger share of the Church's intellectual activity. The principal arguments are isolated texts\* of Scripture, which—some of them the metaphors of poetry and rhetoric, some of them the ordinary phrases of common conversation—were construed with the most literal exactness. The heliocentric doctrine was condemned, not because it was unscientific, but because it was impious. A certain sarcastic Dominican hurled a sermon at Galileo from the text: "*Viri Galilei, quid statis adspicientes in Cælum?*—Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven?" But Scripture texts were not the only arguments. The doctors made pretensions to science; but their scientific arguments are not worth the recording. We give a whimsical specimen. To disprove the statement made by Galileo, that Jupiter had satellites, a Paduan professor held that since there were only seven metals, seven days in the week, seven apertures in a man's head, there could be only seven planets!†

\* The following are specimens: The sun is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race; The sun knoweth his going down; The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down; The world also is established that it can not be moved; Who laid the foundations of the earth that it should not be moved forever? Thou hast established the earth, and it abideth; They continue to this day according to thine ordinances.

† The September number of *The National Quarterly* contains an article on Copernicus. The writer declares his purpose in writing it to be, 1. "To show that Copernicus was a much more profound and original thinker than he is generally regarded at the present day;" 2. "To show how unjust and ungenerous it is to brand as the enemies of science a body of men (the Roman clergy) who . . . have given us, through one of the most unassuming of their brethren, the noble system of the universe which is now universally received." All the facts on which the writer relies to accomplish the latter purpose are stated in the following paragraph: "Thus, we are bound to admit as beyond all dispute, that not only was the system of the universe now universally received founded by a priest of the Church which is said to be an enemy of science, but that it was a bishop and cardinal of the same Church who, above all others, took most pains to have the system promulgated to the world. It was, in fact, they who paid all the expenses of printing the

But it must not be imagined that the Romish ecclesiastics only opposed the heliocentric theory. The purely ecclesiastical spirit is ever the same, whether found in Rome, in Geneva, or in London. Protestant divines were scarcely more pervious to the light than the Catholics; but, from the nature of the case, they could appeal only to argument and denunciation. Their great cry, too, was, "The Scriptures are endangered!" Voetius, a great Dutch divine, who lived in the middle of the seventeenth century, declared: "This we affirm, that is, that the earth rests, and the sun moves around it, with all divines, natural philosophers, Jews and Mohammedans, Greeks and Latins, excepting one or two of the ancients and the modern followers of Copernicus." Heideggeri, a Swiss theologian, who flourished about half an age later, gave the same view, "from which," he said, "our pious reverence for the Scriptures, the word of truth, will not allow us to depart." "Turretine," says Hugh Miller, "was one of the most accomplished theologians of his age; nor is that age by any means a remote one. Tycho Brahe, Kepler, and Galileo had all finished their labors; . . . nay, at the time when his work issued from the Amsterdam press, (1695,) Isaac Newton had attained his fifty-third year; and fully ten years previous Prof. David Gregory, nephew of the inventor of the Gregorian telescope, had begun to teach, from his chair in the University of Edinburgh, the doctrine of gravitation and the true mechanism of the heavens, as unfolded in the Newtonian philosophy." And yet Turretine held the astronomical notions advocated by the persecutors of Galileo early in the century; he defended them with precisely the same arguments.

But, in time, the churchly opposition to the new astronomy ceased. The Ptolemaic theory fell into contempt, and the Copernican was installed in the place it had so long occupied. As in the case of every other true theory, every new discovery adds fresh

work; and finally it was to the head of the Church the work was dedicated; nor was it dedicated to the Pope without his having given full permission; and it is further proved that Paul III had not given this permission till he had made himself acquainted with the character of the work." Admitting that the facts are not all on one side, we must hold that those we have given are decisive of the temper of the Roman hierarchy. But our author condescends to do the work of an apologist. He says, "*It so happened* that a decree was issued from the Vatican the 5th of March, 1616, condemning the great work of Copernicus," etc. This is putting it mildly. We wonder if "it so happened" that Bruno was burned? if "it so happened" that continued indignities were heaped upon Galileo?



confirmation; and yet, even in our own day, ignorant prejudice against it is sometimes found. The arguments used by scholars and theologians two hundred years ago are still sometimes found in the mouths of the illiterate; soon they must fall below even their level.\*

It is deserving of remark, ere this branch of the discussion is dismissed, that the Church had an authoritative geography as well as an authoritative astronomy. In the reign of Justinian, in the first half of the sixth century, there lived, in an Alexandrian monastery, an old monk named Cosmas. For that age he was an extensive traveler; he had an inquisitive mind, and made some pretensions to scientific attainments. This old monk gave to Europe a geography that endured for a thousand years. His book, written to expose the conceived errors of the Manichæans concerning the Antipodes, was called, *Topographia Christiana*, or, *Christian Opinion Concerning the World*. Cosmas described it as a "Christian topography of the universe, established by demonstrations from Divine Scriptures, concerning which it is not lawful to doubt." Just as though it was the office of the Holy Spirit to teach men geography! The notions of Cosmas are thus stated by an able historian of opinions:

"The world is a flat parallelogram. Its length, which should be measured from east to west, is the double of its breadth, which should be measured from north to south. In the center is the earth we inhabit, which is surrounded by the ocean, and this again is encircled by another earth, in which man lived before the Deluge, and from which Noah was transported in the ark. To the north of the world is a high, conical mountain, around which the sun and moon continually revolve. When the sun is hid behind the mountain, it is night; when it is on our side of the mountain, it is day. To the edge of the outer earth the sky is glued. It consists of four high walls, rising to a great height, and then meeting in a vast concave roof, thus forming an immense edifice, of which our world is the

\* A recent number of *Harper's Monthly Magazine* contains an article entitled, "South-Coast Saunterings in England." The writer describes the geologist, Pengelly, and relates these anecdotes: "Mr. Pengelly related many amusing adventures that he and other geologists had met during their researches in the neighborhood, arising chiefly from the horror which the country clergymen had of them. A flint arrow acted on these divines as a red rag on a bull. On one occasion he had visited a poor stone-breaker, whom he found conversing with the parish clergyman. When he showed the poor man a flint arrow-head, and asked him if he had met with such in his work, the parson raised his eyes and hands and rushed from the room. We sometimes fancy that the age in which Galileo vainly tried to persuade the Paduan professors to look through his telescope, which revealed the moons of Jupiter, has passed; but there are several places in Great Britain where that age survives. When Lord Rosse's great telescope was completed, two religious fanatics man-aged to get near it, and were caught in the act of breaking one of its lenses with a stone."

floor. This edifice is divided into two stories by the firmament, which is placed between the earth and the roof of the sky. A great ocean is inserted in the side of the firmament remote from the earth. This is what is signified by the waters that are above the firmament. The space from these waters to the roof of the sky is allotted to the blest; that from the firmament to our earth, to the angels, in their character as ministering spirits."

As the writer from whom we quote observes, "The reader will probably not regard these opinions as prodigies of scientific wisdom;" but the Church clung to them with a tenacity equaled only by that with which she clung to the Ptolemaic astronomy. To sustain this geographical system, passages from the Bible were quoted in which the "face of the earth" is mentioned; also those comparing the heavens to a "tabernacle." Cosmas had said a Christian with such passages before him should not "even speak of the Antipodes!" Some of the mediæval theologians were so liberal as to hold—as Basil and Ambrose had done in an earlier generation—that the subject should not be connected with salvation; but these could not stem the great stream of ignorance and bigotry that swept past them.

These notions of geography—the fancies of a dark age, the conceits of an old monk—greatly interfered with the progress of truth; they also retarded the progress of geographical discovery. When that sublime visionary, Columbus, applied to the king of Spain for means to undertake a voyage of discovery, a council of doctors was called, to meet at Salamanca. This council represented the learning and the science of the Spanish nation. The great Genoese spoke to an august assembly; but when he brought forward his arguments for the sphericity of the earth they were received with derisive incredulity. What, had not the monk Cosmas Idocupleustes disposed of the Antipodes nine hundred years before, by demanding how, in the day of judgment, men on the other side of the globe could see the Lord coming in the clouds? The doctors of Salamanca confuted the globular theory by quotations from the Pentateuch, the Psalms, the Prophecies, the Gospels, the Epistles, and the writings of the Fathers. It was pronounced heretical. Columbus's proposed undertaking received no encouragement from the Spanish ecclesiastics. Despite the aid given by the king, it must have failed, had not the Pizons, an old and wealthy seafaring family, embarked in the enterprise. The discovery of a new world beyond three thou-

sand miles of sea was a severe blow to the patristic geography; but it was not until the San Vittoria, Magellan's ship, had circumnavigated the globe (1519-21) that it was completely shattered. The story of that stern and heroic navigator we can not tell; a single sentence will show the man's spirit:

"But, though the Church hath evermore, from Holy Writ, affirmed that the earth should be a wide-spread plain, bordered by the waters, yet he comforted himself when he considered that in the eclipses of the moon the shadow-cast of the earth is round; and as is the shadow, such, in like manner, is the substance."

"It was a stout heart," says an historian, "a heart of triple brass, which could thus, against such authority, extract unyielding faith from a shadow!"

We have thus seen the Church, in both the Latin and Protestant branches, in a totally false position; we have seen it maintaining that position with the greatest obstinacy. It is but natural to inquire, How came the Church to champion the geography of Cosmas and the astronomy of Ptolemy? Some may say it was owing to the darkness of the age. So, in part, it was. But we can not thus explain why the Church was the very citadel of darkness. Specifically, then, the reason was this: The Church held a wrong view of the office of the Scriptures, asserting that they were given to teach science as well as salvation. The Roman Church is still historically committed to the Ptolemaic system; but practically, this erroneous conception of the office of the Bible, at least in the case of astronomy, is universally abandoned. The Church now adopts the canon of Bruno and Galileo, that the Scriptures were not intended to teach philosophy, but salvation only. This great controversy has passed wholly into history. It is now a burnt-out volcano; the ashes and lava once thrown from the crater are now cold. It is now seen that a man can be a disciple of Copernicus and a disciple of Jesus at the same time. The Church has lost nothing, but gained much, by the revolution. The descriptions of astronomical phenomena found in the Bible are not stumbling blocks to the feet of any who are pressing to the Cross. Besides, the new astronomy furnishes some of the most impressive and beautiful of the natural theologian's arguments and illustrations. The popular thought has crystallized in the proverb, "The undevout astronomer is mad." So far from

the astronomical allusions in the Bible standing in the way of the work of evangelization, Mitchel, the lamented patriot and soldier, the profound philosopher and faithful Christian, has undertaken to show that it is only by means of the discoveries of modern astronomy that some of these allusions can be understood.\*

The discussion of this topic has extended beyond our expectations; but we can afford the space, if we have established the proposition, that it is madness to contend for a literal construction of a text when that construction is opposed to mathematical demonstration. Reviewing, then, this long and heated strife, we are compelled to say—although the innovating philosophers were guilty of some indiscretions, of some slight intemperance of language—the *chief responsibility rests with the theologians*. We now pass to a second topic.

II. *Geology*.—We can not hope to make this topic so interesting as the one just dismissed, and for two reasons: 1. The geological controversy is more recent than the astronomical, and the materials are, therefore, not so fresh; 2. It is impossible to group the facts touching it around three or four leading actors, illustrious alike for their discoveries and for their sufferings in the cause of knowledge. There are none who stand to geology in the relation in which Copernicus, Galileo, and Kepler stood to astronomy.

The old traditionary idea of the creation held by the Church, was this: About six thousand years ago, in a few days' time, God made the universe, with all its furniture, very much as an artisan turns out toys in his work-shop. But soon after the intellectual awakening from that thousand years' sleep, called in history the middle ages, some adventurous spirits began, in the spirit of science, to investigate the physical history of our globe. We may remark, in passing, that they did not receive the sympathy and the countenance of the Church. But so slow was the growth of physical knowledge, that geology did not take rank as an important science until the last quarter of the eighteenth century. It was then applied to practical purposes by Werner, a professor in a Saxon school of Mines.

\* He contends that such passages as the following have waited for an age of scientific discovery to disclose their full meaning: He hangeth the earth upon nothing; he sitteth upon the circle of the earth; hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth? where is the way where light dwelleth, and as for darkness, where is the place thereof? See *Astronomy of the Bible*.

Werner held that the strata of the earth's crust were precipitated from a common menstruum, or "chaotic fluid," which had, in his conception, covered the globe in a remote period. This was called the Neptunian or aqueous theory. Hutton, a contemporary geologist, of Edinburgh, Scotland, held that these strata were the work of fire. This was called the Plutonic or igneous theory. These two men were the founders of two rival schools of geology, between which there raged a war angry as the waves of Werner's sea—intense as the heat of Hutton's fiery abyss. But fuller knowledge led to a broader generalization, and to a settlement of the controversy. It finally appeared that Werner's theory was true of the rocks with which he was familiar in Germany, while Hutton's was true of the formations which he had studied in Scotland. Thus a third theory was formed, by blending the Neptunian and Plutonic. Some of the rocks, it was decided, had a watery, others a fiery, origin. This conclusion has now been unquestioned for half a century. But traces of water and of fire were not the only things found in the rocks; fossil remains of plants and animals—some of living, but many more of perished, species—were found in plentiful profusion. We can not even mention all that is written on the pages of the stony book, nor pause to describe the immense labor expended in learning to read the record. Suffice it to say, all men, whose opinions are entitled to the least consideration, concede that the young science of geology rests on stable foundations. It is not held that it ranks, in point of completeness, with astronomy, nor that there is no uncertainty in some of its theories, nor that all its conclusions are to pass unquestioned; but its facts are admitted, and the legitimacy of its method of argument conceded. We now turn to the theological bearings of the science of geology.

All men, who even so much as looked into the stony records, were impressed with the earth's great antiquity. The life of man, they saw, was short, but the world into which he was born, the theater of his activities, his receptacle when the fitful fever of life was over, reached back over illimitable ages, to the very morning of time. We may take one glance at the steps of this progressive creation. First of all, a nebulous fire-mist, then a sea of liquid fire, then a thick crust of fire-rock, then the condensation of aqueous vapor into water, then the erosions of water and sedimentary deposits, then

vegetable and animal life—first in simpler, next in complexer forms—all these attended by upheavals of the bottom of the sea, followed by depressions of continents, until at last, in the ends of the ages, man stood forth, formed in the image of God, the acknowledged superior of all the creations that had gone before him. Truly it was an amazing revelation! Who can wonder that men hesitated long before they received it?

Long before these positions were incontrovertibly established, the Church had taken the alarm. As we have seen, the early inquirers had not had her sympathy—the later ones experienced her sore displeasure. The ecclesiastics had learned nothing and forgotten nothing. Instead of learning wisdom from their previous encounter with the astronomers, they again took a position of antagonism. Affrighted, they cried out, "What is to become of Moses?" Instead of waiting to see whereunto this thing should grow, they condemned it in advance. Instead of inquiring whether the Mosaic account of creation would bear a construction different from that so long placed upon it, they said, "The geologists must be wrong." Geologizing infidels, hailing the opportunity to form an issue, promptly raised the shout, "Geology and the Scriptures are at variance! Moses is a liar! The Bible is false!" Thus theologians and geologists rushed into positions of entire antagonism, thereby putting religion in a false light on the one hand, and prejudicing the claims of the young science on the other. But there were, fortunately, a few dispassionate theologians, and a few moderate geologists, who mediated between the extremists, and paved the way for a reconciliation between religion and geology. We can not do more than give the clew that led honest inquirers out of the labyrinth:

In 1804, Thomas Chalmers, then an obscure young man, engaged in lecturing at St. Andrews, Scotland, took the ground that the writings of Moses do not fix the date of the earth's creation. He further alleged that, for aught we knew to the contrary, there may have elapsed, between the first creative act and the first day of Moses, an immense interval. His words were these:

"There is a prejudice against the speculations of geologists, which I am anxious to remove. It has been said that they nurture infidel propensities. It has been alleged that geology, by referring the origin of the globe to a higher antiquity than is assigned to it in the writings of Moses, undermines our faith

in the inspiration of the Bible, and of all the animating prospects of the immortality which it unfolds. This is a false alarm. *The writings of Moses do not fix the antiquity of the globe.*"

Finally, the geological evidence became so strong that it could no longer be resisted. Theologians were forced to heed it. Making a virtue of necessity, they reexamined critically the Mosaic records. They now saw that Dr. Chalmers was right when he said the writings of Moses do not fix the globe's antiquity. Their heavy hearts were further lightened by the discovery that the same position had been held by some of the most eminent commentators and critics\* centuries before geologists had laid the corner-stone of their science.

But this was disposing of only one difficulty. We state a further one, which gave far more trouble to those seeking to harmonize geology and revelation. The study of fossils had given rise to these questions: How shall the history of the Creation given by Moses be reconciled, page by page, with that given by Geology? Is there evidence in the rocks of creative periods corresponding to the six demiurgic days of Genesis? The limits of this article will not permit so much as a history of the discussion to which these questions led, much less a critical examination of the various theories of reconciliation that have been suggested. We can merely outline the theory that is now most prominent. It is substantially that of which the lamented Miller was the most illustrious champion. The query was raised: Does the language used in Genesis force us to the conclusion that the six demiurgic days were days of twenty-four hours? A closer study of the text led the best scholars to the conclusion that the word rendered day might mean an extended period. In many other passages it obviously had that signification. Here again the modified interpretation had the weighty authority of some early commentators. Among the Jews, Josephus and Philo had regarded the six days as metaphorical. Among the early Christians, Origen had held the same view; while St. Augustine had said, "It is difficult, if not impossible, for us to conceive what sort of days these were." The matter, then, stood thus: On the one side, the best Bible critics made to geology this overture; on the other, the most eminent geologists

\* Among those that held this view, on purely critical grounds, were Augustine, Theodoret, Justin Martyr, Basil, and Origen.



said, this interpretation corresponds, at least approximately, to the chapters of physical history written in the rocks.

We may state another point raised in these heated discussions, although it is a little aside from the direct line of our argument. We refer to the controversy touching the Deluge; a controversy among believers rather than between them and men of science. It could not be expected that in an age of physical inquiry, so thrilling an act in the drama of history as the Flood would pass uninvestigated. In fact, it had often occupied the attention of learned men before the rise of geology, and the most absurd and fantastical notions concerning it had been put forth. Probably no question raised in the geological controversy has a more checkered history. The conclusion finally reached is, that geology is silent respecting it, suggesting no real difficulties, affording no substantial confirmations. But the thorough discussions of the subject have materially modified the opinions held by the best-informed scholars. These tell us the Noachian Deluge could not have been universal. The argument is twofold: (1) The language of the inspired historian does not, of necessity, make it universal. This, too, is an old opinion. Able commentators, such as Bishop Stillingfleet and Matthew Poole, who lived two centuries ago, held, on purely exegetical grounds, that the flood was but partial. (2) There was no need of a deluge covering the entire globe to accomplish the purpose. Besides, scientific investigation has made it quite clear that all the species of animals could not have been preserved in the ark without a succession of the most stupendous miracles; and to this there is no occasion for resorting.

What, then, is the status of the geological controversy? Truth will not permit us to say that it, like the astronomical, has passed wholly into history; still we are fast leaving it behind us. If we can not say that it is a burned-out volcano—if we still find some warmth in the old ashes and lava—nay, if there be even yet an occasional eruption from the crater, it is still true that no believer apprehends danger to the Christian vineyard. The Gospel stands on as firm a foundation as it did before the geologist had turned a single stone, or exhumed from the rocks a single fossil. Men listen to the story of the Cross as deferentially—sinners forsake their sins and come to God as readily—as in the days when the old interpretations of Genesis passed unchallenged. But is there any thing positive? This we

may safely affirm: The law of progressive development which pervades the Kingdom of Grace—*first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear*—is found to pervade also the Kingdom of Nature; the natural theologian finds in the stony book some of his choicest arguments and illustrations; some portions of the Scripture revelation find in the strata of the earth strong confirmation, thus verifying the promise, "Thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field." Having gained this standing point, it is difficult to repress a smile when we survey some of the perplexities of our fathers. When Sir Charles Lyell, a generation ago, undertook to demonstrate that the Niagara River had been thirty-five thousand years in scouring out its channel, a reverend anti-geologist denounced his calculation as a "stab at the Christian religion!" As though the antiquity of the gorge through which the waters of the great lakes find their way to the sea stood in a relation of antagonism to the work of the Christian ministry!

We have undertaken to divide the responsibility for the unhappy conflict of Religion and Science between the theologians and philosophers. We have also said that in the astronomical controversy the former were almost wholly in the wrong. But in the geological controversy it must be more equally divided. In this article attention is chiefly directed to the false position of Churchmen, for reasons so obvious that we need not state them. But we have all along had it in our mind to say that the record of the geologists, as a class, is far from creditable. While their science was still in an inchoate state, they were not content to await its matured conclusions; they must hasten to raise an issue with religion. Leaving out of account that considerable class of men who clearly saw that both religion and geology had a foundation—who firmly believed that in the end the two would harmonize—the case stands thus: On the one side was an illiberal and timorous class of believers, chiefly Church functionaries, who hastened to condemn a science of which they were almost wholly ignorant; on the other was a class of boastful and irreligious geologists, who hastened to do a much rasher thing, namely, to condemn an old and beneficent religion. The result was that both, falling upon a rock, were broken.

We have not taken the pains to put these facts in literary dress simply because they are in themselves interesting. They have their

moral. Perhaps we shall perform our readers a service if we draw that moral out into form. They show that the welfare of the race demands two kinds of intellectual activity, one religious, the other scientific—that these interpenetrate each other and are yet distinct—that the minister of reconciliation is to give himself specifically to the one, the natural philosopher to the other; they show that it is no one of the theologian's functions to decide, as a theologian, on scientific questions—that it is no one of the natural philosopher's functions to decide, as a natural philosopher, on religious doctrines; they show that the Church has put herself in a false position by going out of her sphere—that science has prejudiced the cause of truth by deciding on matters that are not amenable to natural law; they show that in two instances, when the human mind was ready to take a long stride in the advance, the ecclesiastics attempted to arrest it by their illiberal and ignorant opposition; they show that in both these instances religion and science have been harmonized, despite the fears of the believer, and the confident predictions of the infidel.

Surveying these two controversies from the point of view which we now occupy, we see how easily both of them could have been avoided. Had the theologians been men of moderation, had they been in sympathy with scientific inquiries, had they studied geology in the light of its own evidence, had they dispassionately reexamined the Scriptures, they could scarcely have failed to discover two very useful canons of interpretation, which would infallibly have led them out of their difficulties: (1) That the Scriptures were not given to teach science, but salvation only; (2) That the language of Scripture is not scientific, but optical; that is, the inspired penman described phenomena as they appeared to be. This second canon deserves a word of comment. The very purposes for which a revelation is made left the inspired writers no alternative. Had the language of exact science been used, the Scriptures would not have been understood by those to whom they were addressed. Accordingly they speak the language of the time in which they were written, which, like all popular language, is the language of appearances. Even yet we speak the language of the Ptolemaic astronomy; we hazard the conjecture that there has never been an almanac compiled that described astronomical phenomena in heliocentric language. To the learned and unlearned alike the sun still rises and sets; and so it will continue

to do as long as it gives its light. Neither are we here placed at any disadvantage. "The leading religions of the East which still survive," says Hugh Miller, "such as Buddhism, Brahminism, and Parseeism, have all their astronomy, geography, meteorology, and geology, existing as component parts of their several systems." Unquestionably, the scientific weapon will prove most efficient in destroying these false religions. Sacred books can not long hold their place in an enlightened community if they are plainly opposed to scientific demonstration. We stand on a vantage-ground. The fate of Christianity is not contingent on the fate of any astronomical or geological theory. The Book of God speaks the language of the people, and so endures, whether the *Almagest* of Ptolemy or the *De Revolutionibus* of Copernicus is the received text-book in astronomy. Thus the fact urged by infidel philosophers against the Bible—that it does not speak the language of science—in the hands of the sound logician becomes an argument in its favor.

We have confined our attention wholly to two controversies, the astronomical and the geological; one of these is wholly historic, and the other will soon become such. We conclude, for the present, with some general reflections which we esteem important.

The center of the Christian System is not any scientific fact or doctrine, but the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. Faith in him is the bond that unites us to God, and not a philosophical doctrine. The man who believes and obeys the MASTER we will receive as a brother, however widely he may differ from us in scientific or theological opinions. So long as the Church confines herself to her mission—which is to preach the common salvation—there will be peace within the walls of our Zion; but when she leaves that, to arbitrate in matters of Science and Theology, disastrous consequences follow. She must not shut out the believer from free investigation into every department of knowledge the God of Truth bids his children enter. Religious men need even yet to enlarge their views of the mission of Science. In the mean time we restate the principal condition of good-will between the ecclesiastic and the philosopher.

If an armistice is ever agreed to between these high contracting parties these will be the leading articles: Religion is a legitimate manifestation of the human soul—so is Science; the religious and the scientific are two modes of thought, ever blending, ever shading

into each other, the two poles of the human mind; the theologian may carry on his inquiries independently, so may the philosopher; the theologian may not call the astronomer away from his telescope, or the geologist from his chisel and hammer, to listen to the first chapters of Genesis—the scientist may not interrupt the believer's prayer with his talk about "a settled order of nature." Adopting the figure of the quaint old divine who compared Reason and Faith to the two sons of the patriarch, there can be no quiet in the family of promise so long as either son seeks to supplant his brother.

In the case of new scientific discoveries, let the theologian and the philosopher, for the time being, work on independently; let not the former be in undue haste to measure the latter's theories by his texts, nor the latter to measure the former's texts by his theories.

The theologian need not abandon science, although its later discoveries seem antagonistic to his cherished opinions; the scientist need not abandon religion, although his last-gleaned facts seem hostile to its truths. There is no absurdity in one's holding, at least for the time, two lines of thought which seem to lead to the most widely opposed conclusions. Of course, comparison and coördination must finally come. Then there will be agreement—at least not antagonism; for truth is one. Thus, after coming up through many contradictions and antagonisms, the unity of truth will appear to those who have the constancy to endure—sad fact that most seem resolved, like the pilgrim Israelites, to fall out by the way. Assuredly we Christians can afford to examine, and to wait in patience, to possess our souls. What have we to do with an error or a lie but to throw it on the immense heap of rubbish that the past has accumulated?

Thus, an armistice between Reason and Faith may be proclaimed, and an armistice that will lead to permanent peace. Then both of the parties to this old quarrel will see their mistakes. Then it may be seen that a man may be both an inquirer and a believer; that he may have both a Science and a Religion. Such a day as this will yet come. The Past believed, but its faith was the faith of ignorance; the Present doubts, but its skepticism is the skepticism of partial knowledge; the Future will believe, and its faith will be the faith of a perfect science. We await the intellectual millennium, when Reason and Faith, the lion and the lamb, shall lie down together, and the frailest child of God shall lead them.

## V.—INDIFFERENCE TO THINGS INDIFFERENT.

"Some have attached too much importance to matters not essential, and have contended too earnestly about them."—WHATELEY'S *"Rise, Progress, and Corruptions of Christianity."*

See Recent Discussion on "EXPEDIENCY AND PROGRESS," in the *"Millennial Harbinger"* and *"American Christian Review."*

THE caption chosen for this article does not represent all that is to follow, since things of minor importance, as well as things indifferent, shall receive attention as we pass along. The intention is mainly to show our tendency to eliminate that which is of little or no consequence, instead of reaching the central thought in a given system of things. A full examination of this subject should not fail to destroy all confidence in *rationalism*—in man's ability to reason out all religious truth from the data this world affords. His constant election of the merely accidental and adventitious, instead of substantive reality, the transient instead of the permanent, and the form instead of "the power of godliness," ought to create a salutary distrust of his unaided ability to manage his spiritual interests for either this world or the next.

To grasp the substantive, the non-transient, and essential—to elect these from among those things that accidentally adhere to them—requires Divine wisdom, coming down from above. No illustration of man's failure to do this more palpable or more shameful need be sought for than is found in the various human bases laid down by religious bodies for Christian union. Take, for example, the essential and indispensable truth that there is one God—"the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, our Savior"—whose being and attributes, as revealed in the Scriptures, ought to suffice us, without any speculation about his form or essence. But infallible man feels so little satisfied with the few barren, indefinite ideas revealed about God, that he must decide "Him to be without body, parts, or passions," and insist upon this as essential to belief in God at all, and rejects all who do not subscribe to his special dogma. This gave rise to another theory, that the Divine Being has a form in all respects like unto man; and hence a sect arose in the Church

called "Anthropomorphists." Now, if salvation depended upon either of these theories, both of which are false, and not upon the essential truth affirmed in the Bible, there might be some apology for the controversy it sprung upon the world; but, as it is, its only use seems to be to show man's tendency to mingle the indifferent and the essential without discrimination, for he might be a true believer in God with or without either of these speculations.

In the same category of things we would place all those questions as to the relative "mode of existence" of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, since we have no likeness of the Trinity on earth, that we know of. True, man's body, soul, and spirit is a *trinity*, for they are "three in one;" and again, in the body alone, we find a *quadrinity*, four in one—the osseous system, the muscular system, the circulatory system, and the nervous system; but whether our little trinity or quadrinity expresses the mode of the Divine existence, we could not say, nor is it necessary to know: although these illustrations prove that there is no contradiction or absurdity involved in the idea of "three in one, and one in three." The thing essential is to believe in the "Godhead," in the language found in the Bible; the thing indifferent is all speculation, about the *manner* of that existence; and yet we may be safe in saying the religious world has been more convulsed over the latter than over the former.

In no single instance, perhaps, have men exhibited their incapacity for eliminating the real *differentia* more than in the conditions required for Christian union and fellowship. The exhortation to be all "of one mind," to be of the "same judgment," and that "there be no divisions among you," has been carried to an injurious degree of exactness, that demands unanimity in things by no means necessary to be united in. A narrow view of the whole scope of the Christian religion fails to see the generous margin allowed for differences among Christians, in a thousand particulars, before their fraternal relations should be the least endangered. All who have believed on the Lord Jesus, and from the heart have confessed and obeyed Him, *are one in Him*, but may not be one in *any thing else*. Christians may not only differ in national peculiarities, in language, in color, in race, in mental culture, in degree of civilization, but may differ in their views of government, in politics, in plans and ways of doing good, and may even differ as regards some religious tenets,



without affecting their Christian fellowship. "In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female." Neither the Jew-part nor the Greek-part of the man comes into Christ, but there is something inside of all that is Jewish, and inside of all that is Barbarian, that attaches to Jesus, and that may be considered apart from all the accidents that made him "Scythian, bond or free;" and this something is the substantive and eternal spirit which, in spite of the accidental accretions gathered on its way through the world, believes and obeys the Redeemer, and, by the grace of God, is so inundated with his light and love that it is not only in Christ Jesus, but becomes a part of his spiritual body.

A Rocky Mountain Indian, found by the Missionary of the Cross, has become a humble, loving disciple of Jesus, at the same time that an elegant gentleman of civilization also from the heart obeys the Gospel of Christ. Bring them together, and when Paul looks upon the two he will say, "In Christ Jesus neither culture nor the want of it availeth any thing, but *a new creature*." The one lays off his blanket, and the other his comely attire—these things are indifferent in the kingdom. The one lays aside his education, as not necessarily any part of Christianity; the other is likewise willing to surrender his ignorance. Then the souls of each dislodge their heavy bodies, as transient and temporal things. Then they may lay aside their respective prejudices, mistakes in action, and misconceptions of Divine truth, and find their spirits standing before God, containing the only thing that "avails in Christ Jesus"—that faith, humility, and love that shows them to be "new creatures." The one was far greater in the world than the other, owing to circumstances not generated by himself, but before God the humbler of the two will be the greater.

The point to be reached by these remarks is, to feel that Christian union does not require oneness in every thing, nor oneness in any thing, except *oneness in Christ*. If the poor Indian has understood but the rough outlines of the Christian system, and is still ignorant of a thousand things not yet learned, and is in error about a thousand others he thinks he does understand—still, if "God has received him," (Rom. xiv, 3,) it settles the question of fellowship with Him, and shows how wide a margin the Almighty may leave for a humble soul that is sincerely seeking the way to heaven.

The utmost care will nevertheless be necessary to prevent latitudinarianism from insinuating itself into our theology, while compassionating the ignorance and honest prejudices of those who need our sympathy; for although Paul says, (1 Cor. 7, 19,) "Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing," he also says, in the same verse, that "*Keeping the commandments of God*" is something. If the Jew could not be won from circumcision at once, Paul was willing to wait till he could *grow him* out of that, provided he was willing to receive Christ and do his commandments, which, although mixed up with the dead rubbish of a really abrogated law, would, after awhile, prevail, and fully "enlighten the eyes of his understanding." Accordingly the preaching on the day of Pentecost did not engage itself with battling against the ceremonial law, but rather simply to insert the Gospel leaven, and give it time to work. The main thing to be gained was access for Christ to their hearts. They feared not error if only truth can be heard, nor darkness if only the "light of the glorious Gospel of Christ might shine into their hearts." There was no indifference as to "the commandments of God"—the indifference was about things really or comparatively indifferent—such as circumcision, Sabbaths, new moons, meats and drinks, and even sacrifices, at the hands of those who really believed in Christ.

It may be difficult to admit that early Jewish Christians continued to offer sacrifices after believing on Christ, the great sacrifice for sin; but the epistles to the Hebrews, to the Galatians, and other Scriptures, show indisputably that Paul labored much to dispossess them of such practice. Besides, in Acts, 21st chapter, we have an account of certain brethren having an offering made "for every one of them." "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of the Jews there are who believe, *and they are all zealous of the law.*" This, of course, implies that the central rite of the law—sacrifice—was not as yet abandoned, for, had they abandoned the law of sacrifice, they could not have been very zealous about any other part of the law. Without farther attempt to prove that they did practice this rite, we may pause and contemplate the tardiness of the human mind to shuffle off its religious errors, and admire the long-suffering of our God in waiting on our "slowness of heart." The seed grows and God waits. As the husbandman waiteth for the early and the latter rain, so the Lord does no violence in forcing the growth of the soul to an

unnatural speed, but has long patience, until faith in Jesus shall have time to displace circumcision, animal sacrifice, new moons, and Sabbath days.

There is a certain degree of spiritual development which only renders a man unhappy, morose, and unkind. It is that degree that has merely learned to *hate sin*, but that has not yet attained to the *love of humanity*. Such a Christian is always censorious, impatient of imperfection in others, and inclined to be very exacting about the ceremonial of religion. He understands the law better than the Gospel, he will have sacrifice rather than mercy, makes little allowance for circumstances, and has the narrow gate narrower than it really is. There may be a true work of grace begun in his heart, but then it is only begun. He lacks that malleable state of Christian sympathy that can become all things to all men, for the sake of winning them to Christ. Instead of leaving his theological moorings for awhile to associate himself with one who is out of the way, and, by gentle tractions, to lead him heavenward, he stands at a safe distance and yells his upbraidings and censures at him, scolding him back to God. Small departures from the truth in another he magnifies into mortal sins, and the narrowest dehiscences are widened into impassable gulfs, while the constant contemplation of peccadillos contracts his mind till there is no room for a large view of humanity, involved as it is in so many difficulties in the way of a perfect knowledge of God.

Not so with Paul. His sympathy for humanity, his love of souls, his knowledge of their weakness, his broad philosophy of spiritual growth, and, above all, the influence of the Holy Spirit—all lead him to make much allowance for men, to wait on their development, and to accommodate himself to their prejudice and ignorance, that he might win them to Christ. When he beheld a soul far from God, he ran to his side, linked his sympathies with his, identified himself with him, *became whatever he was*, and having securely bound that soul to his own, he tried to work his way back to Christ with him. What was the eating of a little meat, or the not eating of it, to him, if he could save a soul thereby? Did he refuse to circumcise a man if that would give him access for Christ to their hearts? Did he stubbornly “stand up for the whole truth” when he saw that many feeble souls could not bear it all? When he saw that his despising a “holy

day" would offend a weak brother, did he stiffly maintain his orthodoxy under pretense of "contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints?" And even if a *quasi* respect to the defunct ceremony of *sacrifice* was necessary to save what little faith they had in Christ, did he, on the plea of being "*sound*," refuse to become a Jew, for the time being, that he might save a Jew? Did he consider it a "retreating to the sects"—Pharisees and Sadducees—when he became all things to all men? The difference between Paul's generous views of these things, and those of small Pharisees of all ages, is just the difference between the divine and the human. With him every thing transient, accidental, and merely ceremonial, was lost in the superlative importance of faith in Jesus, even if that faith should have to keep company awhile with a defunct ceremonial. He knew that the old leaves that fall not off in Autumn, will surely fall at the swelling buds of opening Spring. No rational man ever wishes the darkness of night to break into sudden day without the help of twilight. God has put a green hull around every nut of the forest to protect its tenderness, and to convey its nourishment until the seed is fully matured. This hull gradually dries, withers, and falls off, when the seed no longer needs its aid; but it would be cruel to tear it from its place too soon, and leave the kernel to exposure and to death. Even so the Jewish religion for centuries contained the Christian religion, and could not be torn from around it so soon, nor would the latter have thrived very well under such treatment.

How carefully ministers should deal with the souls of men may be seen from the fact patent to all—that *truth is often, for a time, supported even by error*. Had the Jew been required to renounce Moses and the law at once, on the reception of the Gospel, few, if any, would ever have become the disciples of Christ. Even during his personal ministry, they more than once left off following him on account of his hard sayings—that is, on account of his *true* sayings. But, being allowed to entertain much of their former religion, they received Christ, the Messiah, as a farther development of their own covenant. They received Christ, then, because they were allowed, for a time, to entertain some errors which they were not prepared to give up. How magnificent that spiritual understanding of the Apostle to the Gentiles, who, standing upon God's observatory and seeing things as the Spirit sees them, defines the value of meats and drinks,

new moons, sabbath days, sacrifices, and circumcision ; and, taking up the last as a test-case for all the rest, declares that "circumcision is *nothing*, and uncircumcision is *nothing*"—that "neither if we eat, are we the better ; nor if we eat not, are we the worse"—that "one man esteemeth one day above another, another man esteemeth every day alike," and so *indifferent is Paul to things indifferent* that he allows each one to have it his own way, and be "fully persuaded in his own mind." Meanwhile he comprehends the several capacities of his infantile brethren, and gives milk or strong meat as the case will allow. He will give faith in the sacrifice of Christ time to absorb all the faith they now have in other sacrifices, will give the circumcision of the heart time to dismiss circumcision in the flesh, and keeps urging that "the kingdom of God is not meats and drinks, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit."

An altitude gained like this is so unlike the dwarfish attainments of his own, or even of modern times, that one is in danger of being considered latitudinarian, unsafe, and "unsound," who even surveys the ground on which Paul trod. However, in the ratio in which we can walk with him on these highlands of God, we ought to be able to exercise the same forbearance toward those who fear all this liberty of the Gospel. It can not be denied that the distance between him who said "circumcision is nothing," and him who said "except ye be circumcised and keep the law of Moses ye can not be saved," is very great. Nor can it be denied that the distance is about the same between him who could bear with such ignorance and error in the ancient Church, and him who breaks fellowship with a modern Church that has a small melodeon in their Sunday school. Granting, as the writer does, that there are cogent and well-founded objections to instrumental music in public worship, this departure from the simplicity of the Gospel is nevertheless animalcular compared to those tolerated by the apostles in the early Church—tolerated, not that they approved them—but as the Greek general replied, when asked why he was retreating so fast, "I am pursuing an advantage that lies behind," so, those wise men often found advantages lying in concession to the weakness and ignorance of their brethren.

The "changeable and the changeless," the "flexible and the inflexible" in religion, are expressions exceedingly unsavory to one who does not restrain his denunciations of their authors long enough to

understand what is meant by them. And yet it would be admitted that while the command "give to him that asketh thee" is as changeless as the word of God, the *manner* of obeying the injunction may nowadays differ widely from that which was common in those days, and to which Jesus especially referred. We can now obey this order without ever giving a cent to a street beggar, since our improved methods of taking care of the poor prevent the necessity of it. The taxes and poor-houses far surpass any method ever known in primitive times, and are so complete that city authorities forbid our giving to mendicants. Evidently we are at liberty to feed the poor in a manner different from what the Savior alluded to, and this is what is meant by the "changeable" and the "flexible;" and thus must we adapt ourselves to "the varying conditions of society" in obeying the commandments of God.

Now, while it is the duty of the censorious and fault-finding to imbibe more of the love of God and less bitterness against those who either are, or are thought to be, in error, and so preserve Christian regards, in spite of adventitious differences, it is also the duty of those who are wrongfully represented and misunderstood, to have compassion on those who do them wrong. No one is ever *intentionally* misrepresented by *good* men. Besides, men's intellectual habits, often unconsciously to themselves, lead them into censoriousness and unfair methods of debate. Public debates are sure to spoil the spirits of second or third-rate abilities. A great man, like Alexander Campbell, can debate through many years without contracting those vicious habits of reasoning that so often overtake those of inferior capacity. The vicious and unmanly habits referred to are such as making false issues, where, in a true issue, triumph would not be so apparent; refusing to accept an explanation in the sense in which it was intended; taking no pains to honestly understand an opponent's true position; merely asserting, instead of arguing, where it is believed the populace are known to accept the former more greedily than the latter—these, and all the *ad captanda* intended to slap in the face an argument that can not be fairly met, are weaknesses inherited from many disputings in public, and deserve commiseration on the part of those who have not been subjected to their influence. These are scars left upon the minds of those who have encountered the enemies of truth, and who have not

been able to parry every stroke of the foe, nor to defeat him, without using his own mode of warfare, to some extent. Now, a proper love for humanity will not denounce these on account of their infirmities, although they may be very repulsive. For example—the narrowest-minded men are always the most confident of their own opinions, they are the most denunciatory, and always claim to be the standards of orthodoxy. The more you focalize the rays of heat, the more intense that heat becomes in its contracted circumference; the more general a man's knowledge and sympathies, the more he is disposed, like the sun, to flood the world with his love and gentleness. The strongest focalizers are, of necessity, the most ignorant of men, and such should not always be condemned so much, as it is often their misfortune, rather than their crime. Hence the patience Paul manifested toward his Jewish brethren, who could not lift their eyes from the law, arose from his comprehensive view of the Christian religion, and of the gradual development of spiritual life in the soul; and when we say he was *indifferent to things indifferent*, we do not mean that the errors tolerated were as good for men as the truth, but that none of the above-named were considered of sufficient consequence to warrant unkind upbraidings, or even ill-feelings. Why, then, do modern preachers treat so harshly any one who may not, in practice, but merely in theory, get out of the way a little? One believes in abstract operations of the Holy Spirit; another, that repentance precedes faith; another, that instrumental music belongs to the chapter of expedencies, (or such like;) another, that the title of "Reverend" is innocent enough, and, lo! the dirty feet of Harpies are upon them, as if they were outlaws against the Kingdom of God. Wherefore? Because the religious pulse is low in these theological constables, whose piety has all left the heart, producing a congestion of head religion, consisting in "clear views," critical acumen, sound theory, intolerance of mistakes, however small or however honest, and in denouncing better men than themselves. The gnats are not yet all strained out, nor the camels all swallowed; nor are the "mint and anise and cumin" all gone; the constant selection of things comparatively indifferent, instead of "judgment, mercy, and truth," is still the habit of poor little man.

Why the world always places the intellect above the affections, the head above the heart, might be a question for the philosopher. In



our schools the premiums are given not to the *best*, but to the *smartest* boy. His mind, quick as a steel-trap, triumphs over the other's conscience, sensitive as an angel's. The blunted conscience of the covetous man remains in the Church, the whisky manufacturer and vender take high seats in the synagogue, and half-converted, prayerless souls of the most indifferent grace—if they only hold the doctrines "we teach"—can sit down at the communion table, while hearts the most subdued and mellow with the love of God, and that would die for Jesus' sake, are thought to be unworthy, because of some honest head-mistake as to some theory of religion. In the day when God shall bring up the valleys and press down the hills; when he shall make the "last first and the first last," and "turn the world upside down," the heart will be found above the head, love above knowledge, and a godly life above a sound theory.

Too much attention to the "form of godliness" draws religion all from the inside to the outside, from the heart to the surface. The pushing of the lips toward God, while the errant heart is on an excursion somewhere else, is characteristic of those who object to the healing of a sick man on the Sabbath day. The Catholic and High Churchman give baptism the privilege of bringing the sinner to God without either faith or repentance, and all pedobaptists bring children into the Church by force of this rite alone. This is an election of the form without the substance, the husk without the ear, the shell without the seed. It is the antipode of transcendentalism that rejects all forms in religion, and seeks for direct communion with God, without the intervention of a Savior, an ordinance, or a Church. The one has a body and no soul, the other seeks to have a soul without a body. But as long as God shall have soul and body grow together, as complements of each other, so long will he give contradiction to both formalism and transcendentalism. As the substance of food is always obtained from the various forms of food, so is spiritual good found in the forms of religion, while forms alone, without the power of godliness, are like husks for the soul.

Richard Whateley has well said, "Some have attached too much importance to matters not essential, and have contended too earnestly for them." To "eat with unwashed hands" was a greater offense against Pharisaism than to neglect one's father or mother. Nor did these follies die with the Jewish dispensation. Even now there are

not a few who busy themselves in deciding that *unleavened* bread is most acceptable in the Lord's Supper, since that was what the Savior used; also that because "he took the *cup*," we should, therefore, use but one; and some even assume, that as the Supper was instituted in the "evening," that time should still be observed by us—and in an upper room—thus eliminating the merely accidental to the discredit of the real intention of the ordinance. Our inveterate tendency to grasp at the mere husk of religion is farther manifested in the disposition to make the Lord's Supper the *recognition of orthodoxy*, as if "communion" with any one indorses all his theological views. You will pray with a member of another Church, sing with him, preach with him, without indorsing him or compromising your party position; but the moment you eat a morsel of bread from the same platter, in remembrance of Jesus, you feel responsible for his errors. Thus, this divine and soul-reviving rite is diverted from its original purpose, and turned into a denominational hedge, to fence in our orthodoxy.

The Donatists of the fourth century inaugurated a war that rent the Church for two centuries, on a question of the "regularity" of the ordination of a certain bishop, growing more and more pious as the battle waxed hotter, paying no attention to the havoc made of all the real interests of the cause. Whether a Papist gets drunk just after receiving the "sacrament" or not, he must *not* deny the doctrine of "*real presence*." He may be guilty of petit larceny, but must never doubt the dogma of the "immaculate conception." Many a long day was spent in dispute whether clergymen should wear white or black gowns—at last, *black* was incontrovertibly proved to be more orthodox than white, the robe of righteousness, meanwhile, attracting very little attention. The Rev. Mr. Tyng has been cashiered for preaching the Gospel in a Methodist meeting-house, without regarding certain *red tape ceremonies* which God never commanded him to observe. Another of his brethren, a few years before, was arrested by the Church constables, in Canada, for officiating without the authorized clerical attire. O! mint, mint, mint! thy markets are always crowded, while judgment, mercy, and truth still go a-begging—peddled from door to door. Men are dying without God, while the called and sent "successors of the Apostles" are fixing their phylacteries and enlarging the borders of their garments.

What are the agonies of the victim on the rack, compared to the fame of him who would paint a dying groan; and what is the salvation of men compared to ecclesiastical forms, priestly etiquette, surplices, black and white robes! Preached in a Methodist meeting-house! Judgment be upon him. Damn him well. He ought to have known better.

The "mint, anise, and cumin" of the New Testament do not fairly represent these priestly stupidities, but represented the less important matters of the law of God, and "ought to be done" when justice, mercy, and the love of God are not thereby compromised; but this elimination of the commandments of men, this *odium theologicum* stands in the way of both the greater and the less commandments of God. Formalists, Pharisees, and hypocrites never "go and learn what this meaneth—I will have mercy, and not sacrifice," inasmuch as they always prefer the sacrifice, or some other formality, to the subjective part of religion. With them, the disciples had better starved a fortnight than to "pluck the ears of corn on the Sabbath day;" would rather let the sick go down to their grave than be healed on the Sabbath day, or to carry his bed. But the Savior taught them he would prefer a kind and merciful heart in them to all their sacrifices; that these are, although right, the mere "cumin" of the law. "He shall have judgment without mercy that hath showed no mercy," no matter how many sacrifices he may have offered. "If ye forgive men their trespasses, your Heavenly Father will forgive you," for *this*, rather than for your obedience in the most costly outside ordinances.

The great Legislator for men has even made a difference between the intrinsic value of his own laws—some he calls "the greatest commandments," and some "the least commandments." Rather than not have the regular temple service go on, on the Sabbath day, he would allow the priests to "profane the temple" by doing its servile work on that day. Rather than not have David and his men fed when "a hungered," he permitted them to eat the show-bread; and when the disciples plucked the ears of corn, he allowed mercy to take the precedency of mere legality, showing that, as the "Sabbath was made for man," whenever the Lord of the Sabbath saw it was in the way of man's interests, on some emergency, it had to yield to the higher law of mercy. Now, if God's own commandments some-

times were made to stand aside, that he might bring some greater good to his creatures, how ineffably presumptuous for men to post their traditions on the way to heaven, and say—"Except ye do these ye can not be saved!" As in all ages, "fools still rush in where angels fear to tread," and exalt the accidental to the position of the truly essential. Nevertheless, after all that has been here said, the meed of honesty and sincerity must be awarded to most men in the midst of all these mistakes. Our minds take in but a small part of Divine truth at a time; we can look directly at only a few degrees of the great periphery of things, and sometimes very unimportant things enter in and take up all the room. Still, we should not fail to learn the several lessons easily deducible from the foregoing considerations.

1. That other people have as good a right to be imperfect, and to entertain mistaken views, as we ourselves, and that, perhaps, they no more frequently exercise that right than we do. We must remember that they are still in the flesh, and that their three or four pounds of brain is all they have to work with. And being encompassed about with so much infirmity, they, of course, cherish many mistakes, until educated and developed from childhood to manhood. Nor are these intellectual prejudices fatal to their salvation, where God sees a true heart that would do just right, were that right but fully known. The question with God is, not so much "how far have you got along," as "which way are you going?" If he sees that faith in Christ, although associated for awhile with faith in other sacrifices, is winning the soul heavenward, he waits for the precious fruit to ripen. A little of Christ's leaven will leaven the whole lump, and it is only those who have not quite enough religion to love humanity, that become impatient and intolerant of faults no greater than their own.

2. We must learn to eliminate from all the errors of good men the single fact, that Christians *are growing*. They may be standing on the very first round of Jacob's Ladder, amid much of the fog and miasma of the earth, seeing nothing very clearly; but if the eye is fixed upon the Star of Bethlehem, and the soul cries out, "Nearer, my God, to thee"—then "take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones." Many a gem is covered up with mud and rubbish, but it is a gem for all that. When the "Mountain of Light"—the center jewel now in Queen Victoria's crown—was first picked up in one of the gulches in Golconda, by a peasant, it seemed, to the common eye,

so rough and ungainly that he sold it to a jeweler for a very small sum. And even after its value was appreciated, it required three years' grinding, by the lapidary, to shape it, and bring its true effulgence out. And may not a true love for the Savior be found in company with intellectual mistakes about new moons, sacrifices, Sabbath days, and even about some doctrines of the New Testament? If any one deny this, does he not thereby demonstrate his own ignorance of the more advanced lessons of Christianity?—a mere beginner in Bible study? These primer scholars always think they have gone through the encyclopedia. The Pharisees could make no apology for the disciples plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath day, while Jesus could compassionate that sinful woman, and look for some spiritual development even in her heart. We establish schools in every State for the development of idiots, kindly named "feeble-minded children," and, after years of toil, the faintest intimations of intellectual action, evoked from a fearful depth of inanity, are hailed with delight as proofs of capacity and pledges of mental growth. And when certain persons manifest a moral incapacity parallel to this, we must not "break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax." Whatever you do, take heed that ye despise not "*the little ones*," for a Father's love will protect them if it put a millstone around your neck; for in the great day when Christ shall make "the first last and the last first," it may appear that the most ignorant and mistaken disciple will reveal a greater struggle made against infirmity, and a greater agony to enter the Kingdom of God, than those who judged and condemned them in the days of their flesh.

## VI.—THE SECRET OF ROMAN CATHOLIC SUCCESS.

THE fact of this success will not be denied. The number of Roman Catholics in the United States is unquestionably increasing, and increasing steadily and rapidly. A part, doubtless the larger part, of this increase, is without significance; but the whole of it is skillfully employed by a people who understand well the use that may be made of such a circumstance, in proof of the strength of Catholic arguments, and the adaptation of Catholic doctrines to American minds and institutions. Thus, the fact of increase in the past is made tributary to success in the future. Nor is this argument to be despised. A system which commends itself to no one; which, after a fair trial, makes no converts, comes very soon to be despised and neglected. On the other hand, there are multitudes of men, who, without troubling themselves to look at the proof of abstract doctrines, and without being capable, in many cases, of doing so, conclude that claims which have been recognized by large numbers of intelligent and earnest men, must be strongly supported.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Romanists take special pains to keep their growth in numbers, wealth, and influence prominently before the public. They have even increased the amount of their stock in trade by borrowing freely, not to say recklessly, from the future. By the year 1900—so we are confidently assured—Catholicism in the United States will outnumber all Protestant sects combined. This may or may not be true. Ecclesiastical arithmetic is not always reliable. It has largely overestimated past successes; and when fancy is added to pride and policy, as elements in the problem, the result can hardly be classed as one of pure mathematics.

Figures may be at once accurate and delusive. The numbers which the Catholic Church in this country claims now, as compared with those claimed twenty years ago, may be correctly stated, and yet the statement produce a false impression. We shall, for example, mistake the meaning of these figures, if we fail to notice that the two main elements of increase, emigration and natural propagation, are utterly without significance. By the first, Catholicism has gained

here only what it lost abroad ; and by the second, it has multiplied itself merely from within—a circumstance which can have no bearing on the problem of its influence upon those without. And after we shall have eliminated these two elements, it will be found that the conquests made by this Church, whether from the world or from Protestantism, are far less than would be likely to be supposed upon a superficial consideration of its statistics.

Still, it is certainly true that such conquests have been made. Here and there, all over the land, Protestants of a peculiar turn of mind have become Catholics. The cases are well known, because they have been carefully heralded. And even admitting that they are comparatively rare, they are not without significance, in showing the ability of Catholicism to assert its claims, with some measure of success, upon the free people of this age and country. This is still more signally manifested in what may be called the *social* advancement of the Church. It is growing in respectability. The morning paper makes it a polite bow. Candidates for Congress shake it warmly by the hand. State legislatures vote it tokens of dear love and esteem. Grave monthlies speak of it in terms of most *brotherly* affection. Many Protestant Churches give it a *quasi* recognition ; and some are even proud to dress themselves in its old clothes !

The substance of a late paper in the *Atlantic Monthly*, on "Our Roman Catholic Brethren," is, that Catholicism is recovering its audacity ; is beginning to strike back at its assailants ; knows how to raise money ; appreciates the power of perfect organization ; is making converts from Protestantism ; and that Father Hecker is a living representative of the genius and power of the Church in America.

But what is the secret of all this ? Has the Church made converts from Protestantism by simple audacity in striking back at its assailants ? by the sheer "power of perfect organization ?" by understanding and using the arts and trickeries for raising money ? Far from it. All these are but auxiliaries. Organization, however perfect, and however potential as an aid, can do nothing by itself. Such an agency, though supported by millions of money, and urged on by unspeakable audacity, could never convert one single intelligent and serious American to Fetichism, or any other form of open and undisguised Paganism. Organization can effectively present and press the



claims that are sought to be advanced ; but the real strength of the effort, the true motive power of the machinery, will be found to lie, after all, in the claims themselves. Unless these either be, or seem to be, good ; unless they appear to meet the wants of the human heart, and to satisfy the demands of the human intellect, they will be rejected, whatever the skill with which they may be advocated, or the power with which they may be pressed.

The true source of Catholic influence, the true secret of this Church's success, is to be sought, therefore, in *the character of its claims*. Blazing tapers, gorgeous robes, artistic music, costly architecture, may captivate the frivolous and unthinking, but intelligence and earnestness look beyond and behind all these, to the vital elements and distinguishing doctrines of the institution. If it be conceded, as we think in all charity it must be, that intelligent and earnest men *have* been converted to Romanism, the question will arise, What was it that converted them ? What essential good was *offered* and *promised* by the Church, which captivated their heart and their intellect ? The promise thus made may have been delusive ; the Church may not have possessed the good which it offered ; but still it *claimed* to possess it ; and insisted that it could be found nowhere else ; and it could only have been with the hope and expectation of finding it that any sincere man ever voluntarily entered the fold of that Church. If, now, we can ascertain what these *good things* are which the Catholic Church insists that she alone possesses, and to secure which, therefore, men enter her communion, we shall understand the real secret of her success, and be able, at the same time, to appreciate the wants and weaknesses of Protestantism.

Disregarding matters of minor importance, it is evident that the essential claims of Catholicism, those by which it would commend itself to us, and upon which it chiefly rests its case as against its great antagonist, are precisely those which *ought* to characterize the Church of Christ, but which do *not* characterize Protestantism. Hence, thoughtful and earnest men are becoming more and more dissatisfied with the latter, and it is not to be wondered at if, in some cases, they have mistaken the *image* of truth in the former for the truth itself.

Now, the Church of Rome claims to be, 1. Apostolic ; 2. Catholic ; 3. One ; and, 4. Infallible.

These, we shall, insist, are all elements or features of the true Church of Christ. Not one of them really characterizes the Church of Rome; but of all of them she exhibits a *simulacrum*—a *likeness* more or less perfect, which the unwary and unlearned in the Scriptures too often mistake for the original. We shall, in respect to each one of them, direct attention both to the picture and to the reality of which it is the image and resemblance.

i. Romanism declares, with every appearance of sincerity, that she is the holy *Apostolic* Church; the identical Church founded by the Apostles, which has come down from their days, with an unbroken chain of succession, and uncorrupted transmission of doctrine. By so saying she invites us to a comparison. She says, in effect, "Here is the Roman Catholic Church, a living institution, whose character and doctrines may be known and read of all men; and there is the original Apostolic Church, whose faith and doctrine may be equally well and easily known; they are one and the same Church—compare them and see."

There is a manly confidence in the claim as thus presented, which commends it to favor. The question of the "succession" is put in a tangible shape. It is not necessary, when the point is stated in this way, to travel over the whole intervening space between Simon Peter and Pius IX—between the Church planted at Jerusalem and the Church existing in Rome. All this dark, difficult, and dangerous journey is avoided; and the claim is demonstrated to be either true or false, by a much shorter and more satisfactory process. We are required only to place the two Churches side by side; if they are essentially the same, the succession of the one from the other will be readily admitted, and the *apostolicity* of the latter be as manifest as that of the former. If, however, they are not the same, but in their essential natures different, then the mere historical *succession* of the latter can not, and does not, prove its *apostolicity*.

We are convinced that the value of an outward "succession" has been greatly overestimated. There is no Church, Greek, Roman, or Protestant, which is not able to trace itself back, through a regular chain of history, to the days of the Apostles. Historically considered, they all have, and can all prove, the succession. Every Church came out of some other Church; every division was the division of a Church previously existing. Hence the thread of history belong-

ing to any sect in any part of the world, so far as it pertains to the human beings connected with it—that which we recognize as the living body, sect, or Church—reaches back to the Primitive Church.

But the Catholic tells us this does not meet the requirements of the case. He admits that the Arians of the third century succeeded personally and historically to the Apostles, as certainly as the Trinitarians. He knows that the Greek Church can establish the same kind of succession, and as indefeasibly, as the Roman. He will scarcely deny that the English and German Reformed Churches, which came out of the Catholic, had, at the time they came out, the very same succession that it had, and that since that time there has been no historical break in their chain. True, they have given birth to numerous sects, as the Catholic Church gave birth to them; but the offspring, in either case, has the same ancestry as its mother. Consequently, the bare fact that the Church of this generation succeeded to the place of the Church of the last, and that to the place of the one preceding, and so on, to the Church of the Apostles, is of no force in the argument. Being the same for all, it can be appropriated by none. Hence, we are necessarily directed to a different field of inquiry.

The Scriptures foretold that there would be a falling away from the *faith*, and a corruption of the *doctrine* of the Apostolic Church, notwithstanding the perpetuity of the historical and outward succession. Hence, the true Apostolic Church is that which retains the Apostolic faith and doctrine. Thus, we are furnished with the simple and perfect rule by which the claims of the Catholic Church are to be tested. If her faith and doctrine are precisely the same as those of the Church planted and instructed by the inspired Apostles, then she is what she declares herself to be, the holy Apostolic Church. But if she fail, when subjected to this test—if she lack the *true* succession of faith and doctrine—then her outward and personal succession is worth no more to her than to the hundred other heretical sects, large or small, which equally claim, and are equally entitled to claim, it. And it is precisely when subjected to this test that she does fail—totally, ruinously, hopelessly fail. And so conscious is she herself of this failure that she has been forced to reverse the very process of proof, and to rest her apostolicity upon her historical succession, than which there could be no sandier foundation.

We have too much respect for our readers to institute a comparison between the faith and doctrine of the Gospel and the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. Suffice it to say, they are identical in no single particular that distinguishes the Catholic Church. She does not even claim that they are identical; but instead of it, treats us to the monstrous pretension that the chain of *external* succession to which she holds *entitles* her to break and disregard that which is *internal*. She offers us, therefore, only the outward *image* of a genuine apostolicity, in which there is nothing true, living, or salutary.

2. We shall not dwell upon her claim to catholicity. Although it is one that she takes peculiar delight in parading, it is evident that if her apostolicity fails, her catholicity is only the catholicity of error. Still, there may be persons among our countrymen who are confounded, if not convinced, by the fact that the Romish Church is so wide-spread over the world. Certainly it is not "universal," as it claims to be, and if it were, it would be no guarantee of its truth. Heathenism may spread over the whole world, and still be heathenism. Falsehood may be supported by the majority, without losing its character. A grand apostasy may "deceive all nations," and still not be the Church of Christ!

But there is a true catholicity, a something adapted to, and designed for, "every creature" in "all the world." And it is, doubtless, with the hope of finding this precious something, this priceless bequest of the Lord, that men look to that Church which claims to possess it. But the slightest knowledge of the Scriptures would suffice to teach them that the Church of Christ is not the Church of England, of America, of Germany, or of Rome, taking its shape and color from the peculiarities of any nation or of any age but the Church of all the world. Not that it must necessarily and in fact be *distributed* over all the world, but that it must hold and teach, and be marked and distinguished by, the identical Gospel which the Head of the Church has *addressed* to all the world. The Church which *this* message collects out of the world, and which continues to live in obedience to *its* requirements, is the only true Catholic, as it is the only true Apostolic, Church. And whether there be but one such congregation, or millions; whether they be scattered everywhere, or confined to a single locality; whether they meet in Gothic

temples, or in caves and dens of the earth, they are still catholic, by Divine creation, and designated as such by a Divine principle.

We may continue, in courtesy, to speak of the Romish as the "Catholic" Church, just as we designate the *picture* of a man by the name of the man himself; but we shall do so with the distinct understanding that her catholicity, judged by the only true standard, is unreal and delusive.

3. The *oneness* of the Church is a capital item in the sum of her claims. The priests of Rome are gifted in portraying and caricaturing the sects and divisions of Protestantism, in contrast with "Catholic unity." It is assumed, and rightly, that the Church of Christ is one; that He founded *but* one; that he delivered to it one faith, and united all its members under one Head. This is true of the Church of Christ; this is also true, we are assured, of the Church of Rome, and is *not* true of Protestantism; consequently, the Church of Rome *is* the Church of Christ, and Protestantism is *not*.

This argument is lame in several particulars. In the first place, it assumes that the unity of Catholicism is the same as that which characterizes the Church of Christ. This is not true. The one is a unity secured by force and maintained by intolerance; the other, the voluntary agreement of men who were left perfectly free to differ. The one *binds* men together by chains of external authority; the other *brings* them together by the force of internal conviction.

Romanism may claim to be apostolic, and be simply amusing; may vaunt its catholicity, and excite only a smile; but when, after exterminating, or anathematizing, and banishing the hundreds of millions who dared to think for themselves, it exhibits the remaining millions of its bigoted and fettered devotees as the realization of *Christian* union, it is really audacious!

The claim is false and delusive, also, in the pretense that the unity of the Catholic Church is essentially different from that of any other sect. With the coolest effrontery she classes all Protestants together, as constituting a multitude of sects, and supposes that we will charitably take it for granted that she, forsooth, is not a sect. "Look outside of *the Church*," she says, "and what do you see? Methodist against Baptist, Episcopalian against Congregationalist, sect against sect, nothing but division and strife!" But might not the Greek Church say the same? or the Church of England? or,

indeed, any separate sect in existence? The Baptists are scattered over nearly all the world; and, find them where we may, in America, England, France, Germany, Australia, India, China, or elsewhere, they have, to say the least, as many and as reliable characteristics of unity as can be shown by the Catholic Church.

The Episcopal Church, taught by her mother, may say, with equal truth and equal audacity, "Look abroad, and what do you see? Catholic against Baptist, Methodist against Catholic, every-where sect warring against sect—only in *the Church* is there perfect unity!" The Catholic claim, therefore, is precisely identical with that of other sects and parties, and fails, as they all do, to furnish the basis, or exhibit the characteristics, of a genuine *Christian union*.

Such a union does not now exist. The Pope himself recognizes the fact by inviting *Protestant Christians* to embrace the occasion of the approaching ecumenical council to come *into* union with the Romish Church. That the Catholic Church is one within itself may be true; that the Episcopal, the Baptist, and other sects, are also respectively one to the extent of their several communions, is true in like manner; but that any one of them occupies the ground, or represents the unity, of the original and only Church of Christ, is not true.

This union, as we have said, does not now exist, having been destroyed by Roman and Protestant sects. But it is one of the objects of this *QUARTERLY* to turn the attention of men away from all sects and sectarian establishments, and to direct them to the Church of Jesus Christ as originally founded and established—the Church which recognized only His authority, and expressed its faith and doctrine only in the language of His Word—as the *beau-ideal* of a true, genuine, and Scriptural union. To this Protestantism *may* attain. It is moving toward it. It begins to see it. Its progress is stimulated and hastened by the necessities of the present, and the hopes of the future. But for Catholicism there is no hope. Her votaries will be chilled forever around her painted fires; and will be content with the deceitful image instead of the substantial reality.

4. In view of the doubts, uncertainties, and differences which obtain in religious society, it is not surprising that men are captivated by a Church which kindly proposes to resolve every doubt and remove every difficulty by the voice of *Infallibility*. Here is something which precisely meets the wants of our case. We can not afford to

live in doubt; we can not risk our eternal interests upon an uncertainty; it will not do to feel only that our road *may* be the right one. It leads to an eternal destiny; and if it is leading us astray, it will soon, O! how very soon, be too late to correct it. Above all things else, then, give us *infallible directions*.

This the Catholic Church proposes to do; declaring that her voice is unerring; her faith, her doctrine, her worship, infallibly correct. Now, if she can satisfy us that all this is true, we ask for nothing more. She essays to do so by assuring us, in the first place, that our private judgment is not to be relied upon; that we can not, without an infallible interpreter, understand the true sense of Holy Scripture. And, immediately afterward, she directs us to certain passages of Scripture in proof that *she* is this infallible interpreter. In other words, she asks us to rely upon the *correctness* of our private interpretation to prove that such interpretation is *not* correct! Our private judgment must first decide that the texts she quotes in proof of her infallible authority do prove it, before such authority can be recognized. Hence, according to her own showing, her infallibility rests upon a fallible foundation. If private judgment is reliable, we do not need an infallible authority distinct from it; and if it is not reliable, the existence of such authority can not be proved. But it must be either reliable or not; consequently, the Catholic claim to infallibility is either unsupported or unnecessary.

Again: By referring the decision of the case, as she must do, to the adjudication of private judgment, she recognizes, in the very act, that this is the highest court of appeal. Consequently, when its decision is against her claim, it is a final and conclusive decision. Now, whenever private judgment has been left free and unbiased, it has uniformly pronounced that the passages cited mean no such thing as she pretends; and hence, that her authority is wholly usurped, and her infallibility altogether without proof.

But what boots it? With characteristic genius, the feeblér her claims the stronger her pretensions. She knows that human beings *desire* to cross the ocean of time in none but a vessel of unquestionable strength. She shows them a sound *deck*: can we wonder that she conceals the rottenness of the *keel*?

Are we then to be left without any genuine infallibility? Are anxious, trembling hearts never to hear the *Word*, save in mockery



of their hopes? Is there no *substance* to which this Romish *shadow* corresponds? no veritable living *voice* whose utterances are *divine*? Surely there is. The Church of Christ is solemnly bound, as she has been divinely enabled, to speak infallibly. And so long as she confines herself to her commission, her voice is really and truly the voice of God. The mistake and delusion of Catholicism lie in the assumption that whatever the Church may *please* to speak, rather than what she is *bound* to speak, is infallible. She is required to preach "*the Word*," to declare "*the whole counsel of God*," to limit her utterances to what He has *already spoken*, to give voice and expression to whatever has proceeded out of His mouth, without diminution, modification, or addition. And so long as she does this, her voice can but be His voice, and her teaching infallible.

Protestantism has grievously erred in this matter. While it has spoken many good words for the Bible, and contributed liberally for its publication, the weight of its example has been largely against its authority. Every sect has its doctrinal system, its distinguishing symbol, its controlling standard, its *something* besides the Bible for an authority. It does not, like the Catholics, claim that this something is infallible, and yet by resorting to it the infallibility of the Bible is practically set aside. Hence it has been the standing taunt of the Catholics that Protestants have *no* infallibility. If they answer that the *Bible* is their infallible rule, the crushing reply is ready: Why do you leave an infallible rule for one that is confessedly not such? There can be but one response, namely, that the creed, the symbol, the prayer-book, is the Church's *interpretation* of the Bible—thus yielding the whole question by abandoning the infallible Word for a fallible interpretation of it. The actual practical rule among these Protestant sects being their human creed or standard, and this laying no claim to infallibility, Protestantism evidently has none. It is not surprising, seeing the Church of Christ is legitimately expected to speak infallibly, and Protestantism, owing to the stupendous folly of her human creeds and symbols, not even claiming to do so, that men should direct their attention to that Church which does make the claim, however falsely and delusively it may be supported.

It is high time for Protestants to perceive the sophism that lurks in the word interpretation, and in all the arguments founded upon it; and to insist that the Word of God, in its plain and obvious sense,

being authoritative and infallible, is to be substituted by no human inventions or so-called interpretations; and that the Church which teaches that word faithfully, and teaches only that, is, to the full extent of such teaching, absolutely unerring. Thus will infallibility be referred to its only possible source, Infinite Wisdom. Thus the fatuous delusion of "authoritative interpretations" will be done away; and by substituting a genuine, in place of a simulated and pretended infallibility, the Catholic will be disarmed of his principal weapon of assault, while Protestantism will exchange the weakness of man for the strength of God.

Such are the essential elements of Roman Catholic success. She claims to possess things which are intrinsically good, while the divided and distracted state of Protestantism enables her to conceal the weakness of these claims, and even plausibly to justify them by contrast.

*Fas est ab hoste doceri.* Let Protestantism become *truly Apostolic* in faith and doctrine; let it earnestly embrace the principle, and mold itself upon the model, of a *genuine catholicity*; let it become *united*, not by forcing its members to *live* together in the *dark*, but by bringing them to *see* together in the *light*—making them of one mind and one judgment, that from the heart they may speak the same things; and above all, let the things spoken, whether pertaining to the elements of the faith, the ordinances of religion, or the growth in grace and in knowledge, be always and only the *Infallible Words* of God; and then it can not fail to be seen that by as much as Truth is superior to Falsehood, by so much is the Church of Christ superior to the Church of Rome. Thus, and only thus, in our judgment, will the tide of Roman Catholic successes in America be arrested and turned back.

## VII.—THE UNION OF CHRISTIANS—HOW CAN IT BE ACCOMPLISHED?

NO question has ever agitated the public mind of more transcendent importance than Christian Union. The Savior prayed that his disciples might all be one, and his apostles constantly enjoined upon the Churches the necessity of the same thing. Hence, we ought to conclude, from these facts, even if we had no other evidence, that the subject is of the very greatest importance.

The history of the Church is a standing exhortation to all Christians to endeavor to keep the "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." Division has been the weakness of the Church from the beginning to the present time; and we can not hope for any signal and permanent triumph of the cause of Christ until these divisions are healed. Weak-minded and bigoted sectarians may undertake to justify, or at least apologize for, the present divided state of Christendom; and these may even contend that it is essential to a speedy triumph of the truth; but all candid, intelligent, and earnest Christians know well enough that these divisions are the weakness and shame of the Church, and that only in "union is there strength."

During our late civil war many of the clergy were among the most prominent to contend for the unity of our Government. They even went so far as to devote a large portion of their public ministrations in the pulpit to the discussion of the subject; and it can not be denied that their exhortations had very considerable influence in determining the course of the Northern people.

We do not propose now to discuss the wisdom of such a course on the part of the clergy. Among Christians there is some division of sentiment as to the propriety of using the pulpit for such a purpose. But, however this may be, there can be no two opinions as to the fact that these men now stultify themselves in refusing to coöperate in any great movement for the union of Christians. For, if it was a good thing to have a united country, and we think no one will question this, it is certainly of vastly more importance to have a united Church. One is simply a temporal arrangement, a thing only for

time ; the other is a spiritual arrangement, and reaches, in its consequences, to the great eternity to come.

The present condition of religious society is a curious and interesting study. But that which pains us most is, that on every side we behold a multitude of palpable contradictions, while only here and there is seen that consistency which should characterize the children of God. The clergy, whose constant duty it is to proclaim a Gospel of peace, occupy most of their time in waging a warfare upon each other ; while the people, who claim for themselves a common parentage and common hope, are never so religious as when fighting in the interest of parties. Hence, instead of the one Church for which the Savior died, and which alone is recognized in the New Testament, we have a thousand different and distinct societies, all claiming to be the Church of Christ. Certainly this is not a desirable state of things, and is not that for which Christ prayed, when he said, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us ; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me."

For our present purpose, it will be sufficient to consider society, with respect to religion, as divided into three classes, namely, Catholics, Protestants, and Infidels. And it is of the greatest importance that the respective claims of these should be carefully and impartially considered. It is a very easy thing for Protestants, on the one hand, to denounce the Catholic Church as antichrist ; and, on the other, any rebellion against the inconsistencies and incongruities of Protestantism, as infidelity ; but it is vastly better, and certainly more in harmony with the spirit of Christ, to humbly and earnestly seek for the truth, whether found among Catholics, Protestants, or Infidels ; for this alone can lead us in the path of life everlasting, and secure to us that "rest that remains for the people of God."

Catholicism has unity to recommend it, if it has nothing else ; and it can not be denied that this is one of the chief elements of its strength. But this is the very point at which Protestantism is weakest, and until its divisions are healed, it can not hope for any great success in its efforts to break down the influence of Rome.

Another source of power in Catholicism is the professed infalli-

bility of its utterances.\* The most *certain* road to success is *certainly*. All other things being equal, the Church that adopts an infallible creed will always be the strongest. In religion the human mind requires something upon which it can infallibly rest. Any doubt in reference to the creed is always an element of weakness. The Catholic Church, seizing the idea of infallibility, has steadily clung to it through all ages of its history, with a tenacity which clearly demonstrates its estimate of this dogma as an element of success. And if Protestantism would ever succeed, it must present to the world something more certain than its present limping, halting, hesitating, articles of faith. We must have something better than

"You can and you can't, you shall and you sha' n't;  
You will and you won't;  
You'll be damned if you do, and be damned if you do n't."

But while *human* creeds take the place of the *Divine* creed in the councils of Protestants, we can not hope for any thing like an earnest, vigorous faith, such as is necessary to overcome the world.

The chief weakness of Protestantism to-day is that it has nothing *settled* and *certain* to offer to the people upon which they can, without a doubt, rest their weary souls. True, Protestantism has pretended to oppose an infallible Church with an infallible Bible; but Protestantism has constantly stultified this plea, by requiring an almost indefinite number of conflicting human creeds, in addition to the Bible. And thus, while contending for the freedom of conscience and the right of individual interpretation, Protestants have assumed a position little less tyrannical, and equally as repulsive as that of Catholics. Hence, it will be seen, that in any controversy with Catholicism, Protestantism will labor at great disadvantage in the very particulars where it claims superior excellence. And, although we are free to admit that Protestantism, as a whole, is far better than Catholicism, as a whole, yet candor compels us to say that Catholicism is more consistent and far more powerful.

And now, if we consider the present aspects of Infidelity, the same candor will force us into some admissions, which, though cer-

\*It is a little singular that three of the writers in this number of the *QUARTERLY* have noticed this fact. In one article it is fully elaborated, and its practical bearing on the great religious problem of the age shown to be of the greatest consequence. The concurrence of sentiment on this subject serves to intensify the importance claimed for it.—EDITOR.

tainly true, are generally overlooked by religious teachers. There is a great deal of what is called infidelity that is by no means the worst thing in the world. It is not so much a denial of the truth of the religion of Christ, as it is a denial of what is now called that religion. When the thinking mind fathoms the forms and ceremonies of the Catholic Church, it finds little to satisfy the thirsty soul, and certainly sees nothing in harmony with the exalted spiritualism which characterizes the teachings of the Christ. Weary of this cold, lifeless ritualism, the mind instinctively rebels at such a manifestation of religion; and rejecting this, and finding nothing but inconsistencies and contradictions any where else, it at last seeks peace in what is popularly called infidelity, but which more frequently is simply a seclusion of the soul from the barren wastes of formalism, or the conflicts and turmoils of human creeds. Very much of the Rationalism of Europe and America is not infidelity proper. That is, it is not the coarse infidelity of Hume, Paine, Volney, and Voltaire. It is certainly *not* Christianity; but it has its foundation in facts which ought to make the friends of Christianity blush for shame. There is a species of Rationalism which is simply the protest of the human intellect against the present corruptions of Christianity. It is an effort of the mind to get away from the slavery of ecclesiastical legislation, into the freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right of individual interpretation. The people have long felt that there was something wrong in the present manifestations of religion. Catholicism and Protestantism have alike failed to meet the demands of human nature. There has been, and is now, a wide-spread and growing conviction that neither of these is competent to develop man to the highest happiness in this life, or prepare him for the enjoyment of the life to come. Hence, what is frequently called infidelity, is not infidelity in fact, *but only a rejection of these systems*. And even where this rejection goes so far as to embrace true Christianity, it can be safely affirmed that, in nine cases out of ten, the cause is found in the present unreasonable manifestations of religion. Men are not going to be fools forever. They may lose their souls. In some Utopian voyage after the lights of human reason, they may go down to ruin; but it is braver and nobler to do this, than to live on from day to day in a religious life that is simply self-stultification. Hence, however we

may deplore the consequences of Rationalism, we can not help feeling a kind of sympathy and respect for those who have been driven to it, by the unfortunate condition of things in the religious world.

In this connection, it is important to remember another fact, namely, while Catholicism is losing its influence all over Europe, Protestantism is gaining no immediate strength from this declension of the mother Church. The gain is rather to the ranks of infidelity. Catholicism has recently lost heavily in Austria, Italy, Spain, and in fact almost every Catholic country; but the men who have grappled with its despotic government and hoary ritualism are not Protestants, but infidels—infidels of the type we have been considering—men who feel that there is something better for humanity than either Catholicism or Protestantism—that man has a nobler sphere than to live in the service of ecclesiastical dogmas, or bow to the edicts of ecumenical councils. We do not say that these men have any thing better to offer the people than the systems they reject; in fact, they seem to have no well-defined views of religion at all. They are simply iconoclasts, breaking down the images which now disgrace the religious and political society of Europe, without erecting any thing in their stead. Nevertheless, we are disposed to believe that all this work is in the right direction, and will ultimately end in great good to the social and religious condition of the people. Sometimes things have to get worse before they get better, and although the present demoralization of the Romish Church in Europe may be attended, for awhile, with some uncertainty as to the religious faith of the people, still we believe that a pure Christianity will be the gainer in the end; and, consequently, we are disposed to look with deep interest and much hope upon the great movements now in progress upon the European Continent.

In our own country the same elements are at work. And, although ecclesiasticism is now holding its iron sway over the minds of the people, it can not be denied that there is a restlessness everywhere manifest, which clearly indicates that the old foundations of religious society are beginning to shake. And, while we would not encourage you to expect too much for some time to come, we would, nevertheless, have you cherish the hope that the day is not far distant when the empire of human creeds will be destroyed, and the influence of sectarianism effectually and forever broken down. We



think that the signs of the times clearly indicate that the present state of things can not continue much longer. Every-where the people are calling for something better. Even the clergy are forced to acknowledge that their present systems are inadequate to the conversion of the world. And, while they hold on with terrible tenacity to their peculiar dogmas, they can not help feeling that their present divided and antagonistic efforts are wholly unequal to the great work of rescuing men from the terrible thralldom of sin.

What must be done? It is sometimes easy enough to detect the nature of disease, but to apply a specific remedy is much more difficult. Still, a good physician will always seek for the nature of the disease first, as this will greatly assist him in the treatment. We have already stated the main difficulty in the way of our religious progress. We have seen that Protestantism, which we have been accustomed to accept as the only hope of the world, is defective in three important elements of strength, namely, unity, certainty, and consistency. To give it efficiency it must have these three things; and it is quite useless to expect it to accomplish any great work while these things are wanting. In the first two, Catholicism finds fault with it; and in the last, Rationalism grounds its most unanswerable objections. Hence, to heal the defects of Protestantism, in the particulars noted, is the great religious problem of the present day. Or, to simplify the matter still more, to give *unity*; because to reach this it will be necessary to have both certainty and consistency. Consequently, in the treatment of the subject, we shall confine ourselves to the simple question of Christian union, or, HOW CAN THE DIVISIONS OF PROTESTANTS BE HEALED?

In answer to this question, we wish to state distinctly and emphatically that we have no faith in mere *conventional* harmony. It is easy enough to unite bodies of men in external forms and ceremonies, but to unite them in *heart* and *life* is a much more difficult task. But *true* Christianity does not look so much to outer forms as it does to the condition of the soul. Hence, it is altogether possible for a convention of Protestants to adopt resolutions to unite upon some basis of union, and yet be very far from a union in its most important conditions. To be more specific, we mean this: it is not enough to bring about a mere formal union of *sectarians* on a *human* basis; but a union, to be permanent and effective in the great work of converting

the world, must be a union of *Christians* on a *divine* basis. Hence what we want first is UNITY—"unity of faith," "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace"—and then Christian union will follow. Heretofore we have attempted to do what God never intended should be done: we have attempted to settle all our difficulties in our *own way*, and have, in a great measure, lost sight of the fact that nothing can be done rightfully or successfully in religion that is not in accordance with the Divine will. We hold, then, that the first, and perhaps the most important, step in the direction of Christian union is to settle the question of AUTHORITY in all religious matters. Must we listen to the edicts of Popes, the decrees of councils, the affirmations of human creeds; or shall we reverently and earnestly accept the Word of God as a sufficient rule of faith and practice? Here is where the whole question turns, and vain are all other efforts until a decision is reached at this point. The question of authority lies at the very threshold of any effort at Christian union. And we do not hesitate to affirm that no permanent or desirable union of Christians can ever be effected unless the *Bible, and the Bible alone*, is first accepted as the only source of authority for all religious acts. We say the *Bible alone*, because all Protestants already claim to be guided by the *Bible*; but the trouble is, they do not confine themselves to its teachings *exclusively*. They *add to the Bible* the Articles of Augsburg, Westminster, and such like ecclesiastical utterances. What we want is the *Bible ALONE*. Where it speaks, we should speak; where it is silent, we should be silent. We know that some good people suppose human creeds are necessary in order to determine who is evangelical. But a little reflection, we think, will satisfy any reasonable man that this question is not so easily decided, and that the popular phrase "Evangelical Christian" has a very uncertain and indefinite meaning. Let us look at this matter for a moment. The usual way of deciding the question as to who is evangelical is as follows: The Methodist agrees to call the Presbyterian "evangelical" if the Presbyterian will return the compliment. This the Presbyterian is generally willing to do. Hence, they two agree to call each other evangelical. And what they agree to call evangelical *is* evangelical; for the law is, "every thing shall produce after its kind." This is a fair statement of the popular manner of settling this question, except the Scripture quotation, which we have generously supplied for the benefit of all persons

who may hereafter reason in this way. But it is said, "a rule is a bad one that will not work both ways." Now, let us try this rule in another case. The Unitarian agrees to call the Universalist "evangelical," and the Universalist, in turn, agrees to call the Unitarian "evangelical," and what they agree to call evangelical *is* evangelical; therefore, Unitarians and Universalists are *evangelical*! How do creed-makers like this reasoning? and how do our orthodox brethren like the consequences of their own logic? All this inconsistency can readily be avoided by taking the Word of God alone as our guide in all religious questions. Let every man be free to examine it for himself; and in the light of its teachings, and in the conscientious fear of God, unite with all men who are like-minded in the glorious work of the world's redemption from the curse of sin.

But there is another question, of very great importance, that needs to be considered in this connection. We refer to the thing to be believed, in order to have the faith necessary to be a Christian. Is there no test on this subject? Are we left at liberty to believe any thing or nothing, as we may think proper? Certainly he who said, "Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be who find it," would not have left his Church without some protection against an unworthy membership. The Scriptures assure us that the Lord's people are a "peculiar people;" that they "are not of the world," and that the "world is unworthy of them." It is clear, therefore, that the way into the Church is through some decided and definite test. That test is the "obedience of faith."

First, then, What is faith?

Second, What is the obedience that proceeds from it?

In order to decide these questions, we must let the Scriptures answer. What they say we must say; where they are silent we must be silent also. What, then, do they say on the first question? "He that believeth on the *Son* hath life." "Ye believe in God, believe also in *me*." "These things were written that you might believe that *Jesus the Christ* is the Son of God, and that believing you might have life in his name." "Believe on the *Lord Jesus Christ*, and thou shalt be saved." These quotations are sufficient to show that the thing to be believed is that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, the Son of the Living God. And any addition to this simple proposition is not only unscriptural, but places the question of Christian

union beyond the bounds of possibility. It is not our business to ask any one his opinion in reference to this or that difficult theological question. We have nothing to do with his opinions, philosophies, or views in reference to any or all of the dogmas that have so long distracted and divided the Christian world; but we must simply say to him, in the language of the New Testament, "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest." Hence, we conclude that the faith of the Gospel is not *doctrinal*, but *personal*; not belief in a *dogma*, but in a divine and glorious *person*, "who is able to save to the uttermost all who come to God by him." This faith is sufficiently exacting to protect the Church from imposition, while, at the same time, it makes membership possible to every creature. This makes CHRIST the door into the Church, and whoever comes in any other way, "the same is a thief and a robber."

It is easy enough to declare that the man who does not hold the orthodox view of "original sin," "total depravity," "election and reprobation," etc., is not evangelical, and must, therefore, be excluded from the councils of those who regard themselves as special guardians of the faith; but whoever tells us that he believes with all his heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and does what that Christ commands, we will fellowship, and bid him God-speed as a brother Christian, though all sectarian bigots, from the Pope of Rome down to the smallest close communionist in the land, should denounce us as heretics, or turn away from us as "publicans and sinners."

Christ has not suspended salvation on theories and speculations. The Gospel tells the story of a personal sacrifice, a deep and heart-rending agony of the God-man for man. It comes to us with a warm and generous sympathy, from a heart that is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and bids us, even in our degradation, look up and hope. "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Father in heaven give good things to them who ask him." Away, then, with cold, lifeless dogmas; give them to the winds; and let Christians every-where rally around Him who is the "alpha and omega, the beginning and the end; the first and the last;" who is the "chief among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely."

But it is not enough to simply believe in Christ. Even devils

believe and tremble. You must do this ; but you must do more than this. You must believe and OBEY. Hence faith in Christ, and obedience to his commandments, is the only test of fellowship in the Christian Church. Consequently, we must not only have faith, but we must have also "the obedience of faith." But just here another difficulty arises, as to what are the commands of Christ?

The difficulty is not so much as to the necessity of obeying the commands of Christ, as it is to determine exactly what those commands are. But this difficulty is very easily overcome, if we confine the investigation to the Word of God alone. The trouble is, that men will not do this. They prefer rather to listen to the decisions of councils and the utterances of human creeds ; and, consequently, the plain and simple commandments of Christ are tortured into a thousand ungainly shapes before they get through these ecclesiastical interpretations to the people. We do not wonder that the people are perplexed, and forever in doubt as to their religious duties. It was never intended that the Gospel should be understood only by a few self-constituted ecclesiastics. It is for every creature, and its commandments are so easy of comprehension that the "wayfaring man, though a simpleton, need not err therein."

One mistake which theologians have generally made is, they substitute the philosophy of Christianity for its duties. This mistake has been fatal to the peace of the Church, and has greatly retarded the progress of the Gospel in the world. The philosophy of the human organism is a profound study, but the functions of the members of the body are simple and easy to be understood. For example: The peculiar structure of the eye is a profound and difficult subject for investigation, but the *use* of the eye is well understood by all men. Precisely so with the body of Christ. We may not fully understand its sublime philosophy—its wonderful mechanism, so to speak—but all the members of that body may know, assuredly, what are their respective duties. The commands of Christ have respect to duty, not philosophy ; obedience, not theology. Hence, if Christians would ever be united upon the one "foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone," they must forever abandon the fields of theological pugilism, and ascend to the sublime and glorious faith which accepts Christ at his word, and seeks to implicitly obey Him in all things.

Finally, if Christian union is ever an accomplished fact, those who now profess to be followers of Christ must first become more spiritually-minded. According to the Apostle Paul, the principal cause of division in the Church at Corinth was the carnality of its members. They were selfish, and sought only to gratify their selfish desires. Fleshly ambitions had to be satisfied, temporal interests provided for; and thus a thousand worldly lusts broke down the spiritual reign of Christ in the hearts of the members. Such a Church was an easy prey to the spirit of discord. Hence we hear the Apostle earnestly exhorting them to be more spiritually-minded, more Christ-like, more entirely consecrated to Him who had died for them, and washed them in his own precious blood.

The difficulty with the Churches to-day is very much the same as that which cursed the Church at Corinth. We are too selfish, too carnally-minded. We study the interests of *denominations*, rather than the interests of *Christ's cause*. We seek our own glory, rather than the glory of Christ. When men shall every-where abandon their own petty schemes, surrender their own vain ambitions, and bring every thought, every purpose, every word, and every work, to the foot of the Cross, and, with an honest and earnest desire for the peace of the Church and the conversion of the world, consecrate all to the service, the honor, and glory of Him who is "the resurrection and the life,"

"Our present hope and future joy,"

then, and not until then, can we hope for any permanent union among the followers of Jesus, or any success of the Gospel commensurate with the great wants of our suffering race.

Christianity must be more than a form, more than a mere profession, if it shall ever command the respect and govern the hearts of men. Christians must imbibe more of the spirit of their Divine Master, and then they will be led to greater acts of self-denial, and be encouraged to become more active and zealous in the great work to which they have dedicated their lives. Then can every one truly say:

"The dearest idol I have known,  
Whate'er that idol be,  
Teach me to tear it from thy throne,  
And worship only Thee."

## VIII.—THE UNION MOVEMENT—WHAT WILL COME OF IT?

ABOUT a half century ago, the visible and actual union of all the followers of Christ began, in a special manner, to reach the surface of religious thought and feeling. The seed was sown by the Savior in this world long before, but, like some other seed, it was a good while coming up. True, it did vegetate and bloom for a time, at the introduction of Christianity, but the plant was afterward lost amid the divisions and confusion of incipient Popery, and for fifteen hundred years the very phrase *Christian Union* has been a practical nullity among men. The unity claimed by the Church of Rome differs as much from *Christian union* as that Church differs from the Church of Christ. A union maintained by the sword and by their various ecclesiastical penalties, not only fails, in spite of the Inquisition and the stake, to prevent revolt and schism, but fails to realize the spiritual sympathies intended by the Lord, and actually accomplished, in the early days of the Church.

The German Reformation of 1517 demonstrated the impossibility of maintaining a unity of the Papal Church any longer, even by coercion. The impetus given at that time to public sentiment not only released Germany and Switzerland, and England and Scandinavia, from the Roman yoke, but has expressed itself rather too freely in taking different directions in the search after truth. This, too, was somewhat natural, although unfortunate—natural because the whole cyclopedia of religious knowledge was now to be explored, and a division of labor seemed almost necessary for a time, that afterward they might come together in one glorious brotherhood, bringing the accumulated stores of knowledge together, to realize finally the ineffable blessing of oneness in Christ.

As the human eye is incapable of taking in at once all the degrees in a great circle, so the intellect seems to be incapable of thoroughly investigating more than a few truths in a lifetime. It was no more possible for Luther to develop all religious truth, than it was for Copernicus to illustrate and prove all astronomic truth in his lifetime.



From the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus, from the shepherds who watched their flocks by night, till the sixteenth century, had the world believed the earth the center and axle of the whole physical universe. It was enough for one man to simply subvert this notion, and leave others to work out all subsequent problems. It was enough for Luther to prove that Rome and the Pope were not the center and hub of the kingdom of God on earth, and then leave Calvin, and all subsequent Reformers, to develop the after truths.

In making this division of labor, Calvin explored the field with more particular reference to Church organization and order, and the sovereignty of God; the Church of England fought the battle of the Pope's supremacy and religious toleration; while the Wesleys and Whitefield awakened the emotional nature of mankind, pouring the light and love of God into the soul till it felt that religion was a subjective, substantive, and conscious reality. Other exploring parties have gone out in other directions. The Baptists, long ago, proved Baptism to be immersion; the Congregationalists have developed the doctrine of Church independency, all bringing home valuable contributions of truth.

But the work was still incomplete. The time had come when a union of all parties, on the basis of that well-studied Book, was both practicable and important—a plea for which was made with almost matchless power by Barton W. Stone, Alexander and Thomas Campbell, Walter Scott, and others, about fifty years ago. This plea, treated with ridicule or indifference at first, has, nevertheless, been gradually gaining ground ever since, until, within a few years past, it has expressed itself in various ways that promise good results. Not to mention the nearly half a million of "Disciples of Christ" that have banded together to perfect the knowledge of God among men, and who have been pressing *the union of all who love God on the Bible as their creed*, for forty years, other indications of a favorable kind are manifest. Some have proclaimed a want of all confidence in the movements of the Evangelical Alliance; in the efforts of the eight different sects of Presbyterians who have been trying to unite; and in the propositions of a similar character recently before the Methodist General Conference, and the Episcopalian Convention; but to an eye that takes in a larger horizon, these are all tokens of immeasurable good to come. True, the Alliance has not accom-

plished its ends, and the Presbyterian effort has temporarily failed, and the other parties' projects are still uncompleted; but there is nothing discouraging in all this. The first efforts at a European Protestant Reformation by Huss and Jerome were failures, but, like the mighty pulsations of the earth, they indicated a coming strength that was not to be resisted.

It is also admitted that none of them have simply taken the Bible without note or comment as the basis of union, but have been patching and splicing their creeds, in the hope of producing a *tertium quid* to suit all; and in this they will certainly fail, for while the Bible always allows just enough margin for men to differ on, and leaves many things indefinite where accuracy is not necessary, the creeds, on the other hand, always preach a hide-bound theology that allows no liberty of thought, and seeks to be very exact in the mode of the Divine existence, and such like questions, on which the Bible has purposely left us much in the dark.

For these and other reasons, it is not likely that a satisfactory human creed will be generated. Still, the question of *Christian Union* will be pressed upon public attention, and can not be ignored. The various parties now so much and so happily concerned about this matter seem to be utterly unconscious of the fact, that they are very largely indebted to Alexander Campbell and his co-laborers for their present interest in this subject. Like other great and good men, they sowed seed that never came up till they were in their graves; and whether the present generation gives them any credit or not, they will be recompensed at the resurrection of the just. It was more than suggested by those pioneers in this movement, that all could unite on the Bible as a sufficient rule of faith and practice. This thought, though still rejected, will yet assert its right to reign and triumph over every other. Abstracts of doctrines, as in creeds, are like strong decoctions for food. It is better to take food in its bodily form, and better to take the Bible as a concrete than to abstract its teachings in any form.

The first practical result among the different parties will probably be the union of kindred sects of the same genus into one. All the Presbyterians will become United Presbyterians, forming one body. All the Methodists will unite, taking in the United Brethren and the Low Church of England. All Immersionists may also unite,

and thus the work may go on until the kindred species will resolve themselves into their respective genuses. Most of these consolidations may unite upon some sort of formula of doctrine at first, but after balancing themselves awhile, surveying the whole field, and, being encouraged by what has been done, another effort may be made for a final and general union of all who love God and the Bible. The growing tendency to distrust all the works of men will finally bring to the surface the great idea that the Bible, just as it is, must be our creed, as it will then be seen "to be profitable (and sufficient) for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." A new generation, freed from the prejudice growing out of controversy, will then be on the field, and the children will feel willing to do what their fathers could not accomplish. They will refuse an inheritance of bigotry, prejudice, and hate, and will cultivate broader views of truth and humanity, and will learn to eliminate the weightier matters of the law, instead of the mint, anise, and cumin.

As each species and genus of religionists shall have learned something in the respective fields of thought pursued by them, they can now bring their contributions together, and the parties being so reduced in number, the number of questions for settlement will be correspondingly decreased. The Presbyterians will have settled all the questions that divided them before they came into this final conference; the same may be said of all Baptist and Methodist parties. What a paternal and Christian conference can do toward reconciling real differences and dispelling imaginary ones was demonstrated a year ago, when fifteen ministers of the Baptist Church, and a like number of Disciples, met, and held a four days' consultation, in the city of Richmond, Virginia. Although a union was not effected, it was found that on many points, where they had thought the difference considerable, it was really very little; and in cases where they supposed they would find less difference, it amounted to nothing at all—the whole aggregate of difference, when well sifted, concentrating in the design of baptism. Who knows but a similar result might be approximated with others, if a proper effort were only made?

The chief question to be settled would likely be found in the proper action of baptism. But as all Pedobaptist authorities admit immersion to be right, as well as sprinkling and pouring, they would compromise nothing in adopting that practice. Then the immersion

question would be out of the way ; and thus, step by step, an approximation could be attained near enough for all the practical ends of Christian coöperation and fellowship. Concession, of course, must be mutual, no party assuming to itself an infallible orthodoxy it would deny to others. There are certain difficulties, however, in the way which it would be unwise to ignore :

1. Most men fail to see how others can even be honest who deny what is so plain to themselves. They fail to rightly calculate the influences of education, mental habits, and even the different positions in relation to the same things, occupied by different persons. Some one has ingeniously invented a way of painting three different portraits apparently on the same canvas, so that if you stand directly in front of the frame you see a good likeness of Abraham Lincoln ; remove to the left forty-five degrees of circle, and you recognize a fine likeness of General Grant ; then move forty-five degrees to the right of the first position, and you see a good picture of General Sherman. Now place three persons at once in these three positions, respectively, and each one, looking at the same thing, will swear to a different portrait—and all alike honest. Different family culture and teaching, and different surroundings, generally paint many an object differently to us from what it is to another. On this point, then, the main lesson to be taught is faith in the *honesty* of other religious people, as they have nothing to gain by dishonesty.

2. But the chief difficulty of all arises from our unwillingness to grant toleration and fellowship to a mistaken brother long enough to admit of his growth in knowledge ; or rather each one is very willing to admit the fallibility of his neighbor, but not his own, and hence prefers to take in all who differ from himself and his Church, as catechumens for better instruction. But if this most desirable end should ever be effected, each one must take up his Bible as a little child, with a heart fully resolved to accept every word of God without regard to consequences. It is better even to tolerate some mistakes in theory, and even in practice, for a time, if some grander good is about to be accomplished thereby. Choose the less of two evils whenever a choice is inevitable. If Christian union is worth more than weekly communion, or less, let choice be made accordingly, if need be. If Christian union is of more consequence than agreement on the doctrine of election, or less, pursue the same discriminating

course, and so on with regard to all other questions of religious interest. We accept a heathen into the Kingdom of God with less than a hundredth part of the qualification of some whom we reject in civilization. True, we ought to ask more of these than of those; and yet it must be admitted that all along the scale, from the true heathen convert, just "turned from his dumb idols," up to the full-grown "man of God," there may be found precious souls whom "God hath received," notwithstanding their ignorance and imperfections. The main question is—*Has he believed on the Savior, has he felt himself a sinner, and is he striving for the Kingdom of God? Is he willing to obey the plain commandments of God?* We are all far this side of Infinity, and it behooves us to be not too proud of our relative advancement on this first inch of the measureless line of infinite progression toward the perfections of God.

No one could easily be more deeply sensible than the writer of the indispensableness of our believing in the true divinity of Christ, the sinfulness of man, the intrinsic and subjective reality of religion, nor more opposed to all cheap views of the doctrine of the Atonement, the nature of sin, and the work of the Holy Spirit. I am not saying we should be latitudinarian as to any of these fundamental truths, for I am not contemplating a union with parties who deny them. The difficulty seems to be to induce those who agree on all these as the warp and woof of Christianity, to bear with one another in matters of far less magnitude, and that, too, when the object is to circumvent a far greater good. Some faults and differences, comparatively, of microscopic dimensions only, are examined with the strongest magnifiers, to discover deficiencies to be alarmed at; but the one whose eye sweeps the whole line of Jacob's ladder, blesses the struggling souls on every round thereof, compassionates their weaknesses, and bids them hope in God.

What a happy turn in our affairs if the present interest in Christian union should induce a cessation of controversy long enough to give us all time to see how near we agree, and to magnify the points of coincidence for awhile, and give our better feelings and love for humanity a chance to *thaw out* our frozen hearts. Eyeing the differences has been tried a good while; perhaps a change of tactics would be wholesome for all. Upon the whole, we can not but regard the movement under consideration as an omen of good;

a beginning must be made, and whether it expresses itself in the Evangelical Alliance, in the New York "Christian Union," in the "Young Men's Christian Union," in the Presbyterian, Methodist, or Episcopalian movement, it is to be regarded as an unfinished realization of what the brave pleaders for a return to primitive Christianity, *on the Bible alone*, have been striving for, through more than a generation of years. That the work may go on and accomplish more than eye hath seen or ear heard, or than ever entered the heart of man, must be the desire of every lover of Jesus Christ.

---

## IX.—BISHOP—OVERSEERS.

### I.—MEANING OF THE WORD BISHOP.

THE meaning of this word should be sought in the Scriptures by all who desire to understand the nature and extent of the office to which it relates. The sense attached to it by the Greek, Roman, and Episcopal Churches, is not in accordance with Scripture usage. There is no such officer as a Greek, Roman, or Episcopal bishop mentioned in the Old or New Testament. They regard a bishop as "a prelate, or a person consecrated for the spiritual government and direction of a diocese."

The writers of the New Testament may be supposed to have borrowed the word (*ἐπίσκοπος*) from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and to have used it in the sense in which it is used in that book, where it occurs.

Num. xxxi, 14: "And Moses was angry with the *Captains of the Army*—the heads of thousands, and the heads of hundreds, who came from the battle array." Here the word (*ἐπίσκοποι*) bishops, as translated in the common version of the New Testament, simply means commanders of thousands, and the commanders of hundreds—about equivalent to "Colonels" and "Captains" with us. These were military, not ecclesiastical bishops. Zebul is called the (*ἐπίσκοπος*) *bishop* of Jerobaal. Jud. ix, 28. This is not the ecclesiastic

use of the word. Brenton, the late translator of the Septuagint, renders the word by "Steward."

It is written, 2 Kings xi, 15, (Sept., 4 Kings xi, 15,) that Jehoiada, the priest, commanded the Captains of the hundreds, (*ἐκατοντάρχους τοῖς ἐπισκόποις*) the officers of the host [army] to take Athalia forth and slay her "with the sword." Here the (*ἐπίσκοποι*) *Bishops*, or Captains, are called officers of the army.

In the eighteenth verse of the same chapter it is written, that "the Priest appointed (*ἐπισκόπους εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου*) *overseers* in the Lord's House;" that is, for the house, to take the oversight or care of it. This is neither a military nor ecclesiastical sense.

In Job xx, 29, and Wisd. i, 6, a Hebrew name (לַו) of God is translated *ἐπίσκοπος*, *episcopos*, by personification, as we use the word Providence when we mean God. This is neither a military, ecclesiastical, nor civil use of the word.

Joel, the son of Zichri, was the (*ἐπίσκοπος*) *overseer* of nine hundred and twenty-eight of the sons of Benjamin, who settled in Jerusalem after the return from Babylon. This is a civil use of the word.

In a prophecy relative to the glory and happiness of the people of God, occasioned by converts from the heathen, it is written, in the Septuagint, (*καὶ δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντας σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*;) *I will appoint thy rulers in peace, and thy overseers in righteousness*. This is an instance of the use of the word in relation to civil affairs.

Robinson defines it "*an inspector, overseer, guardian*." It is used of *treaties*, by Homer, ii, 22, 225; Hsian, 7, 10, 6; of *laws*, by Plutarch, Sol. 19; of *laws*, by Homer, Od. 8, 163; of *cities*, by Josephus, Ant. 10, 4, 1; of *a patron*, as Minerva of Athens, Dena, 4, 26, 27. The Athenians called the magistrates, who were sent to tributary cities to organize, and to govern them, (*ἐπίσκοποι*;) *overseers*. Schol. in Aristoph. Av. 1023; Boeckh Staatshaush. der Ath. i, pp. 168, 256; Neander Gesch. der Pflanz. u. Leit der chr. Kirche, i, p. 178; and Bibl. Repos. iv, p. 254.—*Robinson*.

The New Testament furnishes the following instances of the use of the word:

I. Acts xx, 28. Paul sent from Miletus to Ephesus and called the Elders of the Church, and told them that the Holy Spirit had made them (*ἐπίσκοποι*) *overseers* of the Church, to "feed" or tend it.



Concerning this passage let it be observed that two things are proved by it, namely:

1. That Elders and Overseers are officially the same.

2. That Elders and Overseers are Pastors. The Apostles told the Elders that the Holy Spirit made them *Overseers*, and he commanded them to (ποιμαίνειν) *tend* the Church of the Lord, which he also called "the flock." He who tends a flock is a pastor or a shepherd. These Elders, or Overseers, were required to tend a flock; therefore, they were required to be pastors, or shepherds.

3. They were the Elders of "the Church" in Ephesus, and of that Church only. They were Bishops, or Overseers, of one Church—not of many; of one Church in one city—not of the Church universal.

II. Phil. i, 1: "Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the sanctified in Christ Jesus, who are in Philippi with Overseers and Ministers." Ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνους. These overseers had the oversight of all the sanctified who were in Philippi—not in any other place. There is nothing in this, nor in the preceding passage, to justify either Catholic or Protestant Episcopacy.

III. 1 Tim. iii, 1, 2: "If any one is earnestly desirous of an overseer's office, he is desirous of a good work. An overseer must, then, be blameless," etc. The Apostle here speaks of the office and work of an overseer; and not particularly of the extent of his jurisdiction. There is, therefore, nothing said of any particular Church, nor of the Church universal.

His office is that of a ruler, and his work that of teaching. His ability to rule must be manifested in the good government of his house, or family. His ability to teach must appear from his aptitude for that work.

IV. Titus i, 5, 6, 7: "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things which are deficient, and (καταστήσεις) place elders in each city as I prescribed to thee." "For an overseer (ἐπίσκοπος) must be blameless as the steward of God." v. 7. He must "hold fast the faithful word," and be able, "by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince the gainsayers." This (οἰκονόμος) *manager of a household*, or "steward," explains the meaning of "overseer," as used in the New Testament.

V. 1 Peter ii, 25: "For ye were as sheep going astray; but are

now returned to the shepherd and overseer of your souls." Jesus is a *pastor*, as well as an overseer of souls. These are all the places in the New Testament where the word is found, and in neither of them is there the least support for the doctrine of episcopacy.

## II. OVERSEERS—THEIR QUALIFICATIONS.

*"An overseer, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. For if a man knows not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God? Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover, he must have a good report of those who are outside, lest he fall into reproach, and the snare of the devil."* 1 Tim. iii, 2-7.

*"If any one (ἐπίσκοπος) is blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly. For an overseer must be blameless, as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to sordid gains; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; holding forth the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince the gainsayers."* Tit. i, 6-9.

These qualifications are required in every case. No man is eligible without them. He who has these is a Christian gentleman, and is an ornament to the Church, and a credit to its membership. It is well for Churches and Evangelists to study this subject thoroughly. The word "must" is understood before every phrase. Thus: An overseer must be blameless; must be the husband of one wife; must be vigilant; must be sober; must be of good behavior; must be given to hospitality; must be apt to teach, etc. Every thing is clearly and emphatically stated; and no Church should place any man in this office who does not answer the description. A thousand votes, and as many ordinations, can never make a Scriptural overseer of any man who fails to fill this description.

If any man desire this office he must strive to fill this bill. If

he finds himself deficient in any particular, he must discipline himself till he remedies the deficiency.

It is laudable to desire this office, because he who desires it, "desires a good work." It is honorable because it is good. The reward also is great. Peter says, that the faithful Elders "shall receive a crown of glory which fades not away, when the chief Pastor shall appear."

Twenty-four Elders occupy a very prominent place in the Revelation of Jesus Christ to his servant John. "And around the throne were twenty-four thrones, and on the thrones I saw twenty-four Elders sitting, clothed in white garments, and they had on their heads crowns of gold." iv, 4. "The twenty-four Elders fell down before Him who sat on the throne, and worshiped him who lives forever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power ; for Thou hast created all things, and through Thy pleasure they exist, and were created." iv, 10, 11. "And one of the Elders says to me, Weep not. Behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has prevailed to open the book, and to loose its seals. And I beheld, and lo, in the middle of the throne and of the four living beings, and in the midst of the Elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God, sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him who was sitting on the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four living beings, and the twenty-four Elders fell down before the Lamb, every one of them having harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sang a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open its seals ; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation ; and hast made us kings and priests to our God ; and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels, around the throne, and the living beings and the Elders. And the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands ; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all

that are in them, I heard saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, to him who is sitting on the throne, and to the Lamb forever and ever. And the four living beings said, Amen. And the twenty-four Elders fell down and worshiped him who lives forever and ever." v, 1-14. See also, vii, 11; xi, 16; xiv, 3; xix, 4.

These passages show clearly that Elders, who are Elders indeed, will occupy an honorable and conspicuous place in the final development of the kingdom and glory of Christ. It is not wonderful, therefore, that their qualifications are of such a high order. Less than what is required would not be in harmony with the dignity of the office. It is not marvelous that these officers are not allowed to be given to wine, to be strikers, greedy of sordid gain, brawlers, covetous, novices, self-willed; but that they are required to be blameless, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, of good family government, of a good reputation among those outside, and to be lovers of hospitality, lovers of good men, and just, holy, and temperate. Let no man seek this office without these qualifications. Office is not an honor to incompetent men; but such are a dishonor to office.

There should be great care exercised as to who is inducted into this office. Young men should be specially trained for the work, that when they become settled in life, and of sufficient age and experience, they may enter this good work. It is well for these young men to devote some years to preaching while they are endeavoring to qualify themselves for the office of overseer. God bless and multiply such young men! We need a thousand of them now.

## LITERARY NOTICES.

- 1.—*First Principles of Popular Education and Public Instruction.* By S. S. RANDALL, *Superintendent of Public Schools in the City of New York.* New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 256. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THE author of this volume has enjoyed the highest advantages, both as to his education, his experience as an educator through many years, and as to his literary associations. Mr. Randall is no hobbyist, no schemer, and no enthusiast; the balance of all his powers is manifest in every article of his most excellent work. For example, he is neither infatuated with ideas of personal liberty in the parents to educate, or not to educate, their children for usefulness in the State, nor does he advocate the doctrine that the State owns the individual, and has a right to violate the liberties and sanctities of home, even for the ulterior purpose of producing the highest styles of citizenship. The rights of both are regarded, and their respective responsibilities marked out with that nice adjustment of thought which has given him his position among the educators of our country. Were the State, as in ancient Sparta, to claim the exclusive right to all children as soon as they can leave the nursery, thereby rupturing all filial and parental associations, a certain degree of mental, and even moral, culture might be reached by the youth of the land, but it would be at such an enormous expense of all the finer feelings that enter so largely into the warp and woof of a well-regulated life, that no well-informed legislator would nowadays advocate such a measure.

The education of the female sex during the last half century, or even the last quarter of a century, has formed one of the most marked features of our times. When Horace Mann, one of Mr. Randall's co-laborers, became State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Massachusetts, it is said that he found a bill somewhere in the Journals of that State, authorizing teachers to conduct the girls in arithmetic as far as to the *Rule of Three*, alleging that this would mark pretty well the limit of their capacity in mathematics. The removal of this deception from the public mind, and the actual development of said capacities to such an elegant degree of strength and refinement has, in the reaction, as is generally the case, oscillated to the other extreme. Here, again, Mr. Randall discovers the

equipoise that always characterizes those minds that are capable of being leaders among their fellow-men. The "*woman's rights*" fanaticism that seeks to drag her from the sanctum she now enjoys, and to shove her out doors to perform the duties of men, is nothing but a reaction from her former position. It would be a sad distribution of human forces, either to put the women out doors, or the men at household duties. We hear certain classes saying much about "man's sphere" and "woman's sphere," but, as Horace Mann once said—"Man has no sphere, and woman has no sphere; each of them has a hemisphere, and if you put them together they will make a sphere." But if either is to invade the responsibilities of the other, it will inverse the order of nature and of God. Give her all her rights, by all means, and among the rest, the right of exemption from going to the polls and from managing the affairs of State. Even if she has a right to dabble in political affairs, it is not what she desires; nor, as a general thing, could she well succeed at this business. She has a right to sing bass, but who would say it would be the best distribution of our musical forces? Still, as our author teaches, let her be educated in the highest degree, and qualified well for every position she can consistently fill.

But the pulse that should beat strongest in the great American heart should be for the *universal and free education of the masses*. Let the nation see to it, that her people be so cultured that not five per cent. shall appear in the lists of the ignorant. This she should do, taking even the lowest possible view of the case, for if there were no hereafter, no eternal state to be affected by mental and moral culture here, there are reasons enough this side the grave to command the exertions of every lover of humanity to secure this end. After limiting ourselves to the present life, we may still leave off all consideration of the personal weal of those to be educated, and in reasons of State alone, find enough to justify the authorities in requiring that every child in the land *shall* be educated. Let the following extract from Mr. Randall's work, page 244, confirm all, and more, than we have said:

"More than half the inmates of our prisons and penitentiaries of every grade are almost entirely destitute of the simplest rudiments of education; and of the residue, but a very inconsiderable proportion have enjoyed the benefits of even the lowest common-school instruction. The closest and most searching analysis of the records of crime, in our own city and State, for the past twenty years, will disclose the names of but very few individuals who have in early youth enjoyed the advantages of what, in accordance with the highest standard prevailing at the time, may be denominated a good education. Of 1,122 persons, being the whole number reported by the sheriffs of the different counties of this State, as under conviction and punishment for crime during the year 1847, 22 had received a 'common education,' 10 only 'a tolerably good education,' and 6 only were reported as 'well educated.' Of 1,345 criminals, so returned for the year, 1848, 23 only had a common, 13 a 'tolerably good,' and 10 only a 'good education.' The whole number of persons returned to the office of Secretary of State, as having been convicted of crime in the several counties and cities of the State during a period of nine consecutive years, from 1840 to 1848, both inclusive, was 27,949; of these, 1,182 were returned as having received a 'common education;' 414 as

having received 'a tolerably good education;' and 128 only as 'well educated.' Of the remaining 26,225 only about one-half were able to read and write. The residue were destitute of any education whatever. Of the 566 boys in the House of Refuge for juvenile delinquencies in this city, 287 had attended school less than six months, and only 41 had attended any public school in the city over three years. . . . The whole number convicted of crime in England and Wales in a single year was 20,984, of whom 7,033 were unable to read and write, 10,983 could read and write imperfectly, 2,215 could read and write well, while only 191 were superiorly instructed. In Scotland, out of 2,922 convicts, during the same period, but 55 were enumerated in the latter class, and 2,539 in the former."

The same results are given for Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, and various pauper establishments of England and America; and it all goes to show that "the ranks of crime and vice are almost exclusively recruited from the ignorant classes of the community," and that precisely in the ratio that knowledge is increased, vice and crime recede.

The State, then, has an inalienable right, in self-defense, to see that her children are provided with such an education, intellectual and moral, as will protect her from the enormous expense of criminal procedure, if there was no higher assignable reason. But if the mental and moral culture urged by our author were only secured by a single city, or State, to serve as an example marked out on the board for all the rest to see, it would soon command the minds, the hearts, the hands, and the suffrages of all.

---

2.—*The New Testament History, with an Introduction, Connecting the History of the Old and New Testaments.* Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D., *Classical Examiner in the University of London.* New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 780. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

STUDENTS of the New Testament have long felt the need of just such a work as this, and Dr. Smith deserves, and will, doubtless, receive the gratitude of all students of sacred history, for the admirable work which he has written upon the important subject he has selected.

His work is divided into three parts. The first gives the connection between the Old and New Testament history, including the relations of the Holy Land to Persia, Egypt, and Syria. In this are narrated the main facts of the general history of the East, during what is called the "Hellenistic" age. And in order to preserve the unity of the subject, this part is very properly brought down to the destruction of Jerusalem. In an appendix which follows, there is a full account of the national and religious life of each separate section of the Jewish nation, their Scriptures, worship, and sects; in fact, every thing necessary to understand the condition of the people at the advent of our Savior.

The second book contains the Gospel history, and is designed to present a clear, harmonized account of the ministry of Christ, as related by the four historians, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Free use is made



of all needful collateral information, but the author has, very wisely, refused to enter upon speculative discussion. He has confined himself to known facts, and hence has given us a *reliable* history of Him "of whom Moses and the Prophets did write." The different views concerning Chronology have received considerable attention, while the appendix contains a discussion of the great question respecting the origin of the Gospels, and also a table of the Gospel Harmony.

The third book contains the Apostolic history, and aims at a completeness not previously attained in any similar work. This part is brought down to the destruction of Jerusalem, and that catastrophe is now exhibited in the light of the Savior's prophecy, as the epoch of his coming in the full establishment of the Christian Church.

Altogether we regard this work as one of the most useful contributions to sacred literature that has come under our notice for a long time. To those who are acquainted with Dr. Smith's great work, "The Dictionary of the Bible," we need not say more than that his "New Testament History" is characterized by the same painstaking, candor, and historical research which have made his Dictionary such an invaluable treasure.

Preachers, Sunday-school teachers, and students of the Bible generally will find in this volume even more than we promise for it. It can only be fully appreciated by being carefully and earnestly studied.

---

3.—*An Exposition and Defense of the Scheme of Redemption, as it is Revealed and Taught in the Holy Scriptures.* By R. MILLIGAN, President of the College of the Bible in Kentucky University. Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll & Co. Crown 8vo. pp. 563. 1869.

WE wish that a copy of this volume could be placed in the hands of every preacher in the United States; for it would, assuredly, work a great reformation in the understanding and appreciation of the Scheme of Redemption.

President Milligan is a ripe scholar, has had long experience as an educator, in some of the best colleges of the land; is now President of the "College of the Bible," in Kentucky University, where he has not less than a hundred young men who are preparing for the ministry under his special instruction. He is, withal, an excellent preacher of the Gospel, a Christian of deep, earnest piety, and a man whose character is, in every way, a fine commentary on all that he writes.

From such a man, writing on such a theme, we ought reasonably to expect a valuable work. And we can conscientiously say that he has met our most sanguine expectations. In fact, the work is altogether better than we had supposed it would be.

It can not be said to be an *exhaustive* work, except so far as generalizations are concerned. It does not always elaborate as fully as some might wish, but we regard this *apparent* defect as one of the things for which the work may be recommended. It was not the intention of the author to consume time and space with needless verbiage. He has studied conciseness, and has succeeded admirably in this respect, though never at the expense of perspicuity. The work is highly *suggestive*, and, while sufficiently exhaustive for all practical purposes, it leaves something for the reader himself to do. He has the key placed in his hands that will open to him the door of almost all mysteries; that will reveal to him the most beautiful harmonies, in all the details of the Scheme of Redemption, from Adam to the end of the Apostolic ministry; but in order to completely master the whole subject, and come into the enjoyment of a knowledge of all the particulars, in the application of the great truths eliminated to the affairs of human life and human destiny, the reader must do some thinking himself, must seriously and earnestly meditate upon the great generalizations which President Milligan has furnished him.

While we thus speak in these high terms of commendation, we do not wish to be understood as fully assenting to all that is in the book. There are some things we could wish were different. But where there is so much to commend, and so little to condemn, we do not choose to discuss that part of the work to which we might take exception.

There are some chapters that are especially worthy of notice. We do not remember to have seen any thing better on the subjects of Sacrifice, Design and Character of the Law, Legal Types, etc., than what is said of these in this volume. The chapter on Types is invaluable. We doubt whether there is any thing better in the English language. In fact, we are certain that no other work gives the Scriptural meaning of types so well.

It is impossible, in a notice of this kind, to do justice to such a work. To give any thing like a fair analysis of its contents, it would be necessary to copy almost the entire work, for every thing is already as concisely put as can conveniently be done. To appreciate the work it must be carefully studied, read, and re-read, and all who will do this will be amply rewarded for their time and labor. To preachers, Sunday-school teachers, and all earnest students of the Word of God, President Milligan's book can not fail to be of inestimable value.

---

4.—*Poems* by JEAN INGELOW. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. 2 vols. in 1. pp. 313-332. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

So much has been said of this popular authoress, both here and in England, it is almost needless to do more than announce the different

titles by which her works are designated, in order to enlist the public favor. No English poetess, save Mrs. Browning, ever commanded such a host of enthusiastic admirers in so brief a space of time. From the period of her first publication, in 1863, her success has been unparalleled. Of her first collection of poems, more than forty thousand volumes have been sold already; of the "Story of Doom" (an imaginative account of the antediluvians, and the escape of Noah and family) ten thousand; of her prose works, about fifteen thousand. Miss Ingelow is a native of Boston, in Lincolnshire, one of the oldest of English towns. Her father was a banker, and her mother is of Scotch descent. Being one of eleven children, her life was passed amid the family circle, where she had the advantage of pious instruction, and an early acquaintance with scenes calculated to develop the richest treasures of her mind and heart. Her writings are deeply imbued with her strong, intellectual, and religious nature, and no appreciative reader can fail of being impressed by her love for nature and reverence for its great Creator.

Her poems are graphic sketches of life in all of its varied phases, and it is, therefore, difficult to give such selections as we would like to do, in this brief and imperfect notice, lest we mar their beauty by interrupting the continuity of thought or description. Like the works of all great masters, they should be viewed as a whole, lest some rare beauty of design be overlooked, some magic tint or shadow be disarranged, or some combination of sweet sounds left out of the grand oratorio. Almost every subject has received new interest from her pencil. The homely scenes of daily life are enhanced, the face of nature glows with fresh beauty, while each of its mysterious voices conveys to her cultivated ear rich undertones of harmony unheard by the passing throng.

"The Songs of Seven" are, perhaps, more universally admired than any of her other poems, embodying, as they do, the different stages of woman's life, from early infancy to old age, with all its intermediate variety of "Romance," "Love," "Marriage," "Maternity," "Widowhood," and "Longing for Home." These songs are now published with twenty-seven splendid illustrations, forming a choice volume for all lovers of the beautiful, and is in itself a high compliment both to the fair authoress and its publishers.

There is a great variety in the subjects treated by Miss Ingelow, and, as before stated, no brief quotations from any of her poems can do them or herself justice. The sentimentalist, or poet, will linger with delight upon many passages in "Divided," "The Star's Monument," "Scholar and Carpenter," and "The Letter L," while graver scholars may gather fresh inspiration from "Brothers and a Sermon," "A Dead Year," "Honors," and "The High Tide," a sad, sweet story of real life. Miss Ingelow has other attractive qualities than those of a mere authoress to commend her to

American readers. She is noted for her beneficence, and devotes nearly all the gains received from the sale of her works in this country to the poor, especially to discharged hospital patients unable to earn their own support. Thus ministering to the physical wants of humanity as well as to its highest spiritual needs, she fulfills no common mission. We predict for her a glorious future. Her genial, sympathetic nature, matured by years of rich experience, can not but prove a blessing to the world, awakening in other hearts kindred impulses and aspirations, and in the years to come, whatever fame or glory may be hers, we trust that, like her own ideal poet, she will still continue

"To teach

Mankind, her peers, the hidden harmony  
That underlies God's discords, and to reach  
And touch the master-string, that like a sigh  
Thrills in their souls, as if it would beseech  
Some hand to sound it, and to satisfy  
Its yearning for expression."

---

5.—*Where is the City?* Second Edition. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. pp. x—349. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

The question propounded in this volume is certainly one of great interest. It is an inquiry for the True Church. The author seems to be deeply in earnest in pressing this inquiry, and shows considerable knowledge of the various religious parties in the United States. You follow him through his various experiences among the Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, Episcopalians, Quakers, Swedenborgians, Spiritualists, Universalists, and Unitarians with a profound interest. But when you come, at last, to "finding the city," you are sadly disappointed. You feel that the whole thing has been "much ado about nothing." For, if that is truth which every man conceives to be the truth, then it matters not whether a man is a member of the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, or any Church at all. In fact, we rather suspect that Israel Knight has become so bewildered by the various religious parties in the land, that he has concluded that it is not necessary to belong to a Church at all. And this seems to us to be the conclusion to which he at last comes.

Now, we confess a deep sympathy for an earnest man who starts out with an honest purpose to find the Church of Christ. In the midst of the Babel confusion upon this subject, he will have a difficult and laborious task. And, as Israel Knight seems to be an earnest and honest man, we are sorry that he made the fatal mistake of seeking for "The City" among the religious denominations into which Protestant Christendom is divided. Had he gone to the "Living Oracles" instead of the various religious parties, he might have received light that would have been of service to him. Men,

who are troubled about where to find the Church, should go to Christ and his Apostles for instruction, for these alone can unerringly lead the anxious and earnest heart to that "City having foundations, whose builder and maker is God." But men who seek for the Church among the sects of a distracted and divided Protestantism, or despotic, sensuous, and unlettered Catholicism, will not be likely to come to any wiser and juster conclusion than Israel Knight has done. In the investigation of this question the Word of God *alone* must be relied on to guide to a correct conclusion. And when this is studied with prayerful sincerity, it will not be difficult to find the Church of Christ. And when found, it will be seen that the whole subject of membership in that Church depends upon a hearty acceptance of these simple conditions, namely: Faith in Christ, and obedience to his commandments.

---

6.—*Seekers After God*. By the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, M. A., F. R. S. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. Cr. 8vo. pp. xiv—336. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

This volume treats of three extraordinary characters, namely: Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius. They were all pagan writers, but are claimed by Dr. Farrar as worthy to be ranked among the "Seekers after God." Of these three, Seneca is the most extensively known, but his character, as an upright man, does not bear comparison with either of the other two. Few men have lived, whose characters were more unsullied than Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius; and though it is certain that neither ever made a profession of the Christian religion, it is difficult to believe they did not have constant intercourse with the early Christians. In fact, it is almost certain that they were familiar with the writings of Christ and his Apostles. Dr. Farrar labors very hard to show that Seneca had no special knowledge of the Apostle Paul, at least that Seneca's position was such that it is altogether improbable that he would have "stooped from his superfluity of wealth and pride of power, to take lessons from obscure and despised slaves, in the purlieu inhabited by the crowded households of Cæsar or Narcissus." And yet, it is altogether more probable that he did this, than that he should have said so many things so similar to the teachings of Scripture, without this intercourse.

To show the similarity between the Bible and Seneca's teaching we present a few passages in comparison:

*Bible*: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?"

*Seneca*: "God is near you, is with you, is within you; a sacred spirit dwells within us, the observer and guardian of all our evil and our good . . . there is no good man without God."

*Bible*: "All things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do."

*Seneca*: "It is no advantage that conscience is shut within us; we lie open to God."

*Bible*: "We ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device."

*Seneca*: "Even from a corner it is possible to spring up into heaven; rise, therefore, and form thyself into a fashion worthy of God; thou canst not do this, however, with gold and silver: an image like to God can not be formed out of such materials as these."

*Bible*: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

*Seneca*: "You must live for another, if you wish to live for yourself."

*Bible*: "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust."

*Seneca*: "How many are unworthy of the light! and yet the day dawns. The gods begin to confer benefits on those who recognize them not, they continue them to those who are thankful for them."

7.—*A Book about Dominies—being the Reflections and Recollections of a Member of the Profession.* Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. pp. 261. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

The style of this volume is pleasant, racy, and very readable. It is full of good practical and every-day thought. It belongs to that class of books that has broken away from the old leaden way of putting things. It goes upon the principle that the shortest distance between two points is a straight line. Instead of dealing in abstractions and dead issues of even a year ago, it sees the follies and stupidities of to-day, and cares not who is hit.

The chapter entitled "Something about Fools" would be an invaluable contribution to that class of our fellow-citizens who ought to see themselves as this Dominie sees them. It is very touching. Hear him:

"And here drive past two fools of the same kind, but of the other sex. They, too, have bartered the simple comeliness and the innocent pleasures of nature for the shallow gilding of art, and the tiresome excitement of fashion. They look very beautiful and proud as they recline elegantly in that padded carriage; but, after all, they are only what they seek to be, masses of silk, steel, and ribbon, with a substratum of flesh and blood, and the sickly remains of a human heart, that God's goodness gives to all, and man's folly can never entirely take away from any."

Other fools get their portion of meat in due season, and with a little more seasoning in it than will be palatable to many of them.

As to the article headed "Something about Sermons," we can not speak with so much praise. True, the author hits off a great many stupidities sometimes found in Church, and even connected with the pulpit. So far it is all well, for the pulpit should not be exempt from criticism, if done in a wholesome way. But there is little to be gained by an author announcing himself a "skeptic," and then pursuing his strictures upon the Churches and the preachers in such a manner as to leave no doubt on the mind of the reader that the Church of Christ shares but little in his sympathies. And, moreover, if there are a few men who "stealthily" preach other men's

sermons, it is unfair to spread the charge over ministers generally. A teacher of youth, as Dominie has been for years, ought to point out the faults of all classes of men honestly, and, at the same time, carefully avoid inculcating any disrespect of religion itself. One apology for the author, however, ought to be made—that he, perhaps, had certain very formal or corrupt forms of Christianity before his mind, and not the simple worship of God in a really Christian Church.

With the above exception, the book is well worth buying, and then well worth reading—valuable to “boys,” to parents, and especially to teachers, who may receive many a practical hint that will never come amiss in the management of their schools.

---

8.—*Over the River; or, Pleasant Walks into the Valley of Shadows, and Beyond. A Book of Consolations for the Sick, the Dying, and the Bereaved.* By THOMAS BALDWIN THAYER. Boston: The Universalist Publishing House. 1867.

This volume is full of tender thoughts concerning a subject of the deepest interest to every one. No matter whether a man is an infidel or Christian, he can not be entirely indifferent to his state “over the river,” or while passing through “the valley of the shadow of death.” Much has been written upon the subject of death and the life beyond, but we are constrained at last to say that we know nothing of these except what is revealed to us in the Scriptures. Still, works that point us to Him who brought “life and immortality to light, through the Gospel,” are always worthy of earnest consideration.

This volume of Mr. Thayer, though not always free from error, and often treating the subject in a somewhat speculative style, may, nevertheless, be read with much profit and consolation by those for whom it is intended.

---

9.—*Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, on the Book of Psalms.* By ALBERT BARNES, author of “Notes on the New Testament,” “Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity,” etc. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. xlvii-374. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

The sphere of Albert Barnes as a commentator may be defined by the term “*useful*.” He is never profound, not often very elaborate, but, nevertheless, is almost always quite exhaustive of all that is necessary to be said concerning the subject he treats. His works are, therefore, highly practical, and, as such, are much more valuable to the general student of the Bible than works of greater pretensions.



The Book of Psalms is a portion of the Word of God that needs to be treated in a practical manner. There is in this book an expression of almost every variety of feeling; sentiments appropriate to almost every variety of circumstance in life; and, when properly understood, is full of highly important instruction, not only as an historical and poetical production, forming an important link in the chain of sacred literature prior to the coming of Christ, but furnishes the follower of Jesus with much that is practical and useful in the experiences and details of the Christian life.

Under the masterly but simple treatment of Albert Barnes this portion of the Word of God will certainly become more popular, as well as be better understood than it has heretofore been.

---

#### FOREIGN LITERATURE.

- 10.—*Friederich Schleiermacher. Ein Lebens- und Characterbild. Zur Erinnerung an den 21. November, 1768. Für das Deutsche Volk bearbeitet von DR. D. SCHENKEL. Elberfeld: 1868. (Friederich Schleiermacher. A Picture of his Life and Character. In remembrance of the 21st November, 1768. Written for the German People by Dr. D. SCHENKEL.) 8vo. pp. viii, 605.*

ONE way of celebrating the hundredth anniversary of a great man's birth is to write a book about him. In Germany this is the usual way. Within the last few years there have been several occasions for this kind of literary activity. The centenaries of Fichte, Jean Paul, and Schleiermacher have all been celebrated in this and other ways. During the present year the patriot, poet, and historian, Ernst Moritz Arndt, ("Father Arndt,") and the great naturalist, Alexander von Humboldt, will doubtless have to undergo this centennial commemoration; and next year Hegel, the great philosophical *rarefier*, and in a few years, Schelling, the great philosophical *mystifier*, will come in for their share of centennial immortality. And we must confess that we think this custom a laudable one, and especially when upheld by those who believe in no other kind of immortality. Then, too, to a certain extent, we are all made participants in the benefits of this periodical hero-worship; for by this means we generally become more intimately acquainted with the objects thereof, and with the claims which they have to the grateful remembrance of posterity. We should certainly be glad if men like Schleiermacher could become more generally known in America, whether by this or any other means. To be sure this is a name which we very often hear in theological circles, and meet with in our theological periodicals, but it would not, probably, be far from the mark to say that real acquaintance with the man and his work is in the inverse ratio to

the frequency with which he is mentioned. Probably no man has had a greater influence on the theology of the present century, not only in Germany, but every-where where the results of German thought and research, be these results heterodox or orthodox in their tendency, have become known to any considerable degree. Himself ignoring all mere party names and affinities, he has been appropriated by all parties, so that his name, like Hegel's, has become an apple of discord between the various ecclesiastical factions.

In this state of the case we can not but be thankful to Dr. Schenkel for his exhaustive and impartial exhibition of the life and character of the great theologian. One may be far from agreeing with the peculiar theological views of Schenkel, and yet recognize his great talent as a popular theological writer, and particularly his talent in the presentation of living pictures of historic men and times. The period in which Schleiermacher's life falls is one of the most interesting in the whole intellectual history of Germany, and a description of this life must be, in order to give the necessary perspective, to a certain extent, a history of the period itself. In other words, it must show how the life and development of the man was conditioned by the influences which surrounded him, how he acted upon them, and how they reacted upon him. This is a difficult task, and yet we think the author has succeeded in performing it.

---

II.—*R. Rothe's Nachgelassene Predigten. Herausgegeben von DR. D. SCHENKEL. Mit einem Lebensbild des Verewigten. Erster Band. Predigten aus den Jahren 1824-28, in der Evangelischen Gemeinde zu Rom gehalten.* Elberfeld. (R. Rothe's Posthumous Sermons. Edited by DR. D. SCHENKEL. With a Biographical Sketch of the Deceased. Vol. 1. Sermons preached in the Evangelical Church in Rome, in the years 1824-28.) 8vo. pp. 528.

RICHARD ROTHE was one of the most remarkable men of the present century—"the greatest German theologian since Schleiermacher," as he has often been called. He was a philosopher and a professed Christian; a theologian of the most positive opinions, a great writer, (not however in the voluminous sense,) and yet without a particle of theological acrimoniousness, of that *odium* peculiar to the tribe, in his composition. Probably no one ever came into personal contact with him without being inspired with love and veneration for him, whether agreeing or disagreeing with his opinions. It is true, that, although believing in the supernatural character of Christianity, and insisting in the most marked and positive manner on the absolute necessity of Christianity, as the means of salvation to mankind, he became in his later years a rock of offense to the whole brood of dogmatists. With him Christianity was not a bundle of dogmas, but a life, drawing sustenance from the great fountain of life in Christ. He did not

believe in making a man's orthodoxy depend on subscription to a creed, knowing very well that no mere "rightness" of intellectual assent, no adhesion to certain prescribed formulas, can be a guarantee of "rightness" of the inward and generative principle of moral and religious life. Not that he underestimated the value of correct views. He devoted a large part of his life to the elaboration of a grand system of theology and religion, on which he was permitted, before his departure, to lay the finishing hand in the second edition of his "Theological Ethics."

It is a source of peculiar gratification to us to become acquainted, through the above volume, with the earlier period of Rothe's activity. The sermons were preached during the time that he held the office of Chaplain to the Prussian Ambassador in Rome, which latter office was then filled by Baron Bunsen, who, in a poem inserted in the second volume of his "Hippolytus," has erected an enduring monument to their friendship. The sermons are filled with tender and glowing piety, as all of Rothe's efforts are. Through all his works, however difficult and abstruse the particular subject he handles may be, one feels the breathings of a supremely religious spirit. Would that some competent hand could be found to translate him for the benefit of the English-reading public.

- 
- 12.—*Geschichte des Zeitalters der Reformation, 1517-1648, von* LUDWIG HÄUSSER. *Herausgegeben von* WILH. ONCKEN, *Professor der Geschichte an der Universität Heidelberg. Berlin: 1868.* (History of the Age of the Reformation, 1517-1648. By LUDWIG HÄUSSER. Edited by WILHELM ONCKEN, Professor of History in the University of Heidelberg.)

THE above posthumous work of the late Professor Häusser is a valuable contribution to the history of the Reformation. While the celebrated work of Ranke makes us acquainted with all the minute details connected with that history, and plunges us, as it were, *in medias res*, so that sometimes we can not see the forest for the trees, the work before us places us at a certain altitude above the actual strife, where the dust and smoke of the battle can not reach us, and lets us look down upon it. Furthermore, Ranke devotes himself almost exclusively to the Reformation in Germany, while Häusser treats of its rise and progress in all the principal Protestant countries. Belonging to the school of Schlosser, Häusser takes a high rank among modern historians. He was, for a series of years, one of the chief attractions at the University of Heidelberg. His lecture-rooms were always filled to overflowing. As the science to which he devoted himself may be said to be the one to which all others converge, and in which they are resumed, so his lecture-room was a point to which the students from all the various faculties inevitably gravitated. He was a man of rare qualifications for a public

speaker; when warmed with his subject his eloquence flowed like a mighty torrent, sweeping every thing before it. His lectures, though carefully prepared, were never written, and so had all the freshness and vigor of immediate production. This being the case, Häusser left few manuscripts behind him; so that the reproduction of his lectures, for the benefit of the reading public, is naturally attended with great difficulties. It is, therefore, a piece of rare good fortune, that a man like Professor Oncken, who is recognized as one of Häusser's most gifted students, was in a position to undertake the publication of the course of lectures on the history of the Reformation. He had made a full stenographic report of them for his own use as a student, and has performed his duty of editor so well that competent judges are unanimous in the opinion that he has reproduced the whole spirit of the master's oratory.

As a specimen of the author's style, and of the spirit in which he handles his great subject, we translate the following paragraphs from the section which treats of Luther's translation of the Bible:

"One is often tempted to ask how it came that this nation, which, ever since the sixteenth century, had been so terribly afflicted by internal and external convulsions, preserved in its depths an indestructible kernel of religious and moral culture, which was not always to be found among the upper strata of the people, (where men were only too ready to give themselves over to foreign influences,) but which remained alive precisely in the lower classes, and which neither the devastations of the Thirty Years' War, nor the deluge of foreignism in the following generations, could disturb? *It came from the fact that with us no cottage was so small, no household so poor, that this book did not find a place in it*—from the fact that Luther's Bible became for the people, properly so called, not merely a book of prayers and devotions, but a book of general family reading; in a word, the whole intellectual world in which the young grew up, and to which the aged returned; the book in which the common man wrote his family history, noting the days of interest connected with his loved ones; the book from whose contents the weary and heavy-laden drew comfort and relief in the hour of distress. This book, the wars, which made a great graveyard, a smoking ruin, of our beautiful Father-land, could not exterminate. When our scholars began again to write Latin, and our cultivated classes to write and speak French, from the solid body of our nation this could not be torn away.

"For the preservation of the sound spirit of our people, which no foreign caricature, no foolish aping of the fashions of the day, could ever corrupt, this book was a panacea beyond comparison. Out of the simple homes of our country parsons, of our citizens and farmers, who regarded Luther's Bible as their all in all, the Reformers of the eighteenth century came forth, and when they began to purify our beautiful language from disfiguring foreign accretions they went back to the inexhaustible treasury of this book, and they found the most lively sympathy, not among the aristocratic scribes, with their learned pedantry, but in the circles where Luther's Bible, ever since the sixteenth century, had remained the standard. Here the deep emotional nature, the 'inwardness' of the German mind, sought and found full satisfaction. This reacted also on our Catholic countrymen, although only at second-hand. And that other part of our character, which impels us to appropriate and assimilate foreign elements of culture, found here a steady, healthy counterpoise, a counterpoise in which the Romanic nations are wanting."

- 13.—*Natürliche Schöpfungs-Geschichte. Gemeinverständliche wissenschaftliche Vorträge über die Entwicklungslehre im Allgemeinen und diejenige von Darwin, Göthe und Lamarck im Besonderen, über die Anwendung derselben auf den Ursprung des Menschen und andere damit zusammenhängende Grundfragen der Naturwissenschaft. Von DR. EARNST HÆCKEL, Professor an der Universität Jena. Mit Tafeln, Holzschnitten, systematischen und genealogischen Tabellen. Berlin: 1868. (Natural History of Creation. Popular Scientific Lectures on the Development Theory in general, and on that of Darwin, Goethe, and Lamarck, in particular, and on the application of the same to the Origin of Man, and to other Fundamental Questions of Natural Science connected therewith. By Dr. EARNST HÆCKEL, Professor in the University of Jena. With woodcuts and systematic and genealogical tables.) pp. xvi-568.*

ONE of Rothe's favorite ideas in the last years of his life, one to which he devoted a large share of his interest and attention, was the reconciliation of Religion with the culture of the modern world, or, as it is sometimes called, the reconciliation of Religion and Science. Of course, he did not fail to see that something more is necessary to this end, than the mere desire of theologians to press modern science into the service of the Church. He saw very clearly that there must be an equally strong desire on the other part to *come in*, without which, all mere ecclesiastical pressure would be of non-effect. So, in his celebrated Eisenach-theses, he called upon those estranged from the Church, the men of modern culture, to come out of their indifference toward every thing ecclesiastical, telling them that they must learn to place a proper estimate upon the importance and the actual power of Religion, of Christianity, and of the Church—telling them, furthermore, that without religion, human society has no permanent basis, and no soul, and that modern society has its foundation, its very root, in Christianity. He thought that if they could be brought to see this, they would conquer their chronic ecclesiophobia, and that, on the other hand, their reëtrance into the Church would be, for the latter, one of the most effectual motives to reform. But the difficulty is in bringing these men to this point of view. Whether there be any real contradiction, any absolute incompatibility, between Religion and Science, or not, (and certainly we do not think there is,) it can not be denied that there is, at present, a very marked degree of incompatibility between theologians and men of science. We should not be surprised if, in the end, it should be found that the cause of all the bickering and strife lies in the fact that neither of the parties understands the other. At any rate, we have in the author of the book whose title stands at the head of this notice, a man who, from the scientific side of the house, will have nothing to do with religion or Church, as they at present exist. And yet, to all theologians capable of appreciating the ancient motto, *fas est et ab hoste doceri*, (it is right to learn even from an enemy,) we would recommend his

book. Ten years ago it was the fashion in theological circles to speak of the Development Theory as a defunct and highly malodorous hypothesis. This is a way we have of disposing of things that do not suit us. All will remember what an unpleasant thrill ran through the theological world at the appearance of Mr. Darwin's book, in November, 1859. Since then it has become very evident that the Theory of Development, true or untrue, is any thing but dead. We are of the opinion that it can not be reconciled with Revelation; and, therefore, those engaged in the arduous but necessary task of reconciling Religion and Science will have to show that it is unscientific. Now, one of the best ways (some think it a *conditio sine qua non*) of refuting a theory is, to begin by trying to understand it. It really seems to be essential to know something about the origin, history, and scope of a given error before attempting to overthrow it. And whatever else we may have against the author before us, we feel bound to give him credit for producing, in the twenty lectures composing his book, not only a faithful exposition, but a complete history of the subject treated. He deserves, and will command, the respect of both friends and enemies; although, for our own part, we must say that we should have been glad to have missed certain indications of a bitterness commonly supposed by scientific men to be peculiar to our cloth.

---

14.—*Novum Testamentum Græce, Ex Sinaitico Codice omnium antiquissimo, Vaticana itemque Elizeviriana lectione notata Edidit Aeth. Frid. Const. Tischendorf, Dr. Theol. et Phil. Palaeogr. Bibl., etc. Cum Tabula. Lipsiæ: F. A. BROCKHAUS. 1865.*

WE presume our readers already have some knowledge of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, discovered by Prof. Tischendorf, yet a few facts connected with it can not fail to be interesting to all students of the Word of God. The following account of the discovery is from *St. Cuthbert's Magazine*:

"It was not until January, 1859, that he found himself, for the third time, within the walls of St. Catherine's, on Mount Sinai, being warmly welcomed by the Superior, Dionysius, with the words, 'God wishes you to discover new columns to support Divine truth.' During his stay, every facility was afforded for the examination of the literature of the monastery; nevertheless, the visit seemed likely to be as unsuccessful as the last, as regards its immediate object, (although several valuable books were found,) when a chance circumstance placed the long-looked-for manuscript in his hands. Preparations for departure were being made, when the steward of the monastery, into whose little cell he happened to enter, informed him that he also had a 'Septuagint,' taking down a bundle of dusty parchments which he placed in his visitor's hands, who, in a few moments, was convinced that the very leaves seen in the basket in 1844, but sought in vain on the last occasion, were there, as well as a great portion of the Bible. On closer examination he found the principal part of the Old Testament, the New Testament complete, with the 'Epistles of Barnabas,' and the 'Shepherd of Hermas.' On this occasion the guest was careful not to be overmuch pleased simply asking to be allowed to take the volume to his cell for examination. His own words,

however, best convey the delight really felt: 'Full of joy, I asked, as if in a careless way, for permission to take the manuscript into my sleeping chamber, to look over it more at leisure. There, by myself, I could give way to the transports of joy which I felt. I knew that I held in my hand the most precious Biblical treasure in existence—a document whose age and importance exceeded that of all the manuscripts which I had ever examined, during twenty years' study on the subject. I can not now, I confess, recall all the emotions which I felt in that exciting moment, with such a diamond in my possession. Though my lamp was dim, and the night cold, I sat down at once to transcribe the 'Epistles of Barnabas.' As the monks did not appear willing to part with the treasure, there seemed no way to utilize the discovery except by copying the whole. To do this accurately was no easy task, as it contained one hundred and ten thousand lines, together with many thousand corrections in other hands, at subsequent times. The difficulty was also greatly increased by the condition of the writing, which, in some places, was so faded as to be almost illegible, even to one well versed in ancient Greek manuscripts. Permission was, however, given to take the book to Cairo, where it could be copied at leisure. While the work was progressing, it was suggested to the monks that the gift of such a treasure would be most acceptable to the Emperor of Russia—the acknowledged head of their Church—who always took so lively an interest in its members.' The consideration of this proposal occupied a long time, partly owing to a vacancy in the office of Prior, without whose sanction it would be impossible to make so important a gift. The conclusion arrived at is well known, and in November of the same year Dr. Tischendorf had the satisfaction of laying before the Emperor, as the result of his labors, a most valuable collection of manuscripts of various dates; but conspicuous among them, like

'Some bright, particular Star,'

shone one well worth all the labor and time spent in obtaining it, '*The Codex Sinaiticus*.'"

The following is a list of the other manuscripts Professor Tischendorf laid before the Emperor: 1. Twelve Palimpsests; 2. Twenty Uncial Greek; 3. Twenty-two Cursive Greek; 4. Nine Syriac; 5. Eleven Copts; 6. Seven Arabic, with some fragments of Turkish; 7. Nine Hebrew, of the most ancient and rare Rabbinic recensions; 8. Five Armenian; 9. Two Papyrus, with a Greek astrolabe.

In 1862, the Emperor ordered three hundred copies of the *Codex Sinaiticus* to be published—a *fac simile*, in folio, of the original—two hundred copies of which were presented to the principal public libraries of Europe, and the remaining hundred generously given to the editor, in grateful remembrance of his distinguished services. About a year later the first edition of the New Testament—with the title at the beginning of this notice—was published, in the ordinary Greek characters.

This manuscript is a valuable contribution to Biblical criticism and sacred literature. In many places the text differs from the authorized English version of the New Testament Scriptures, but these differences always serve to remove obscurities, and shed additional light on the sacred volume. The manuscript was written, most probably, in the time of the Emperor Constantine; hence its antiquity gives it great weight in determining the true reading of disputed passages of the Bible. We are confident its discovery will lead to a better understanding of the Sacred Oracles.



## REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

- 1.—*Zeitschrift für die gesammte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche.* 1869. *Erstes Quartalheft.*

The present number of the above Lutheran Quarterly contains four exegetical articles; one on the hundred and third Psalm, one on Phil. i, 3, *et seqq.*, ("Fellowship in the Gospel,") one on the word *κατακοιτιζανον*, (Rev. i, 15; ii, 18,) and finally the first of a series of "Historical Contributions to the Exegesis of the New Testament" ("On the Family of Herod in the New Testament"). The last-named is a long (58 pp.) and valuable article, which covers the whole ground of the connection of this family with the origin of Christianity. In addition to the above there is a criticism of Prof. Dr. Dorner's recent philosophical construction of the idea of God, and an ill-tempered review of the last General Synod in Baden, together with a long series of literary notices and criticisms, occupying nearly a hundred pages.

- 2.—*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.* 1868. *Viertes Heft.*

The above number of the "Year-books" for German theology contains four principal articles. The first is one of a series on "The Eschatological Doctrines, and their Importance in Systematic Theology and in Ecclesiastical Life," by Diakonus Schmidt. In the present number the writer gives a history, in epitome, of Eschatology, embracing: I. The Ancient Church down to Tertullian and Irenæus; II. The Græco-Latin Church down to the beginning of the Middle Age; III. The Middle Age; IV. The Period of the Reformation; V. From the Rise of Pietism down to Schleiermacher. Prof. Dr. Wieseler furnishes a learned discussion of the character, contents, and origin of the Jewish Apocryphal writing, *ἀνάκλησις Μουσεως*, a Latin translation of which was recently discovered in the Ambrosian Library in Milan. Dr. Steitz closes his very long series of articles on "The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the Greek Church," and Prof. Lipsius discusses at length Tertullian's book "*adversus Praxean*." The present number of this able periodical is exceedingly valuable.

- 3.—*Der Katholik. Zeitschrift für Katholische Wissenschaft und Kirchliches Leben.* 1868. *November.*

There are only two articles worthy of special mention. The first is an attempt to whitewash the so-called Pope Liberius (who, in the year 357, renounced the communion of Athanasius that he might be allowed to return from banishment) clean from heresy. It is a piece of readable sophistry and special pleading. The second is the first part of an article on the "Blood-phials of the Catacombs." It is well known that the Catacombs of Rome were used by the Christians as places of refuge and of worship in times of persecution. They were, however, used more particularly as burial places

for the dead. Here the remains of the martyrs found their final rest; and, after the persecutions ceased, it was considered by all Christians, but especially by the rich and aristocratic, a great privilege to be buried there, so that their remains might be sanctified by local contact with the ashes of so many who had died a violent death in the cause of Christ. In consequence of the convulsions caused by the irruption of the barbarians, the Catacombs gradually ceased to be visited, and finally the very fact of their existence was forgotten. In the latter half of the sixteenth century they were rediscovered, and, naturally, became at once a center of interest for all Christians. They were, of course, objects of especial interest to the Roman Church. Antonio Bosio was the Columbus who opened this new world of gold to the Mother Church. The discovery was as important to the *trade* of the Church as was the discovery of America to the commerce of the world. What cart-loads, what whole ship-loads of "relics" these Catacombs contained! But how were the remains of the martyrs to be distinguished from those of ordinary Christians? After some vacillation, it was finally decided that those niches contained relics of martyrs, which were designated by a *palm* or furnished with a "blood-phial," a vessel containing a red fluid. This decision, given by the *Congregatio Rituum et Reliquiarum*, April 10, 1668, has never been satisfactory even to all Catholic scholars. Between the years 1855-63, the subject was discussed *pro et contra* with great acrimony, until it was thought time to put an end to it. Pius IX appointed a special commission to investigate the matter, and (although it had been proved, that if all the relics marked by the presence of the "blood-phial" were assumed to be those of martyrs, the number of martyrs would be greater than the whole number of Christians in Rome!) it was decided that the decree of 1668 must be sustained. The writer of the above-mentioned article undertakes to prove by *scientific investigation* that both decisions were right.

4.—*Revue Chrétienne. Paris.*

This valuable monthly, edited by M. de Pressensé, the Church historian and author of the *Life of Christ*, promises a series of valuable contributions for the current year. There will be two articles by M. Ernest Naville, (author of "The Heavenly Father," recently translated,) on the "Adversaries of Philosophy;" an article by M. Charles Waddington, on "Philosophy and Religion;" one by M. Mazelet, on the "Origin of Evil;" one by M. Bonifas, on the "Religious Value of the Christian Doctrines;" a study by M. Godet, on the "Revelation of St. John;" two studies by M. de Pressensé, on the "Protestant Crisis in France," and on "The State of Catholicism on the Eve of the Council of 1869;" together with a large number of other articles on important topics.

5.—*The British Quarterly Review*. 1869. *January*.

Among the various interesting articles in this number of the "*British Quarterly*" is a trenchant review of Dr. Davidson's new "Introduction to the Study of the New Testament." Acknowledging the learning of the author as "great in every department of Biblical study," the reviewer disagrees with him *in toto*. In the concluding paragraph he says: "Our best wish, therefore, with respect to the learned, but, as we think, grievously mistaken, writer from whom we now part, is that he may not make a single convert to his opinions." Two able articles on "Church Principles and Prospects," and on "The New Parliament and Mr. Gladstone," discuss the present ecclesiastical situation in England.

6.—*The London Quarterly Review*. 1869. *January*.

"The Mythical and Heretical Gospels" is the title of an important contribution in the current number of the above magazine. It is based on the works of Tischendorf and Nicolas, and furnishes, in compact form, a great deal of information on the subject treated. There is also an able and readable article on "Tertullian," giving an account of the writings of this eminent father of the Church. Also, an article deserving of careful reading is the one on "Philosophy and Positivism." The spirit of it is indicated by the closing paragraph:

"Since all men, conscious of a spiritual nature within them, must have a religion, will the disciples of M. Comte insult our reason, by asking that we give up the *Bible*, and put the *Positivists' Catechism* in its place? Will they mock the most sacred necessities of our nature by demanding that we substitute the '*Religion of Humanity*' for the *Religion of Christ*?"

7.—*The British and Foreign Evangelical Review*. 1869. *January*.

Contributions worthy of especial notice are: "Irenæus," "The Civil Magistrate," "Spain in its Relation to the Reformation," and "The Exegetical Punctuation of the New Testament." The first of these articles gives a well-digested summary of the opinions of Irenæus, showing, at a glance, the importance of his testimony in questions relating to the Gospel history and to the original Constitution of the Church. The second of the above-mentioned articles is an important contribution to the discussion now going on in England respecting the "disestablishment of the Church."

8.—*The Contemporary Review*. 1869. *January*.

The "*Contemporary*" is one of the spiciest of the English reviews, and always contains matter worthy of perusal. Its articles are never heavy; they are always "popular," in the best sense of that word. The current number contains an article by Dr. Hannah, entitled, "One word more on the Clergy and Science." It has been preceded by others on the same topic, (Sept., 1867, and Dec., 1868,) by Dr. Hannah and Mr. Farrar.

## EDITORS' ROUND TABLE.

---

THE OLD YEAR AND ITS LESSONS.—It is the duty of the Christian to carefully study passing events. To know the times in which one lives, is knowledge of the greatest importance. And especially is it important to know the times in which *we* live. The present age is one of the most remarkable that has ever dawned upon the world's history. Hence, we may reasonably expect that each year, as it passes away, will be crowded with deeply interesting historic events.

The year 1868 has passed into the tomb of the ages, and it is now our duty to study its history, and appropriate its lessons. In Europe, the great absorbing events of the year were the Revolution in Spain, the Reform Movement in England, and the new interest manifested by the governments of Europe in the Cretan Insurrection. These movements all have a profound religious significance. Religious liberty is already vouchsafed in Spain under the new government, and that long-degraded and priest-ridden people have now an opportunity to become free. The Bible will soon be found in every household throughout that land, and this, of itself, will insure the people against a return to spiritual bondage.

And should the Liberal Party in England make good their present prospects, the disunion of Church and State there is only a question of time. There is a far deeper interest involved in this controversy than is seen in simply the Irish Church question. The *status* of the Anglican Church is likewise involved; and the moment the Irish Church question is decided in favor of the Liberal Party, the people throughout the whole of England will be virtually free from the payment of taxes to support a clerical aristocracy in the Established Church. And though the disestablishment of that Church may not take place directly, it can not be delayed for any great length of time. Surely does the world move.

The Cretan revolution is not of so much consequence in itself as in the complications to which it is likely to lead. We can not see clearly the end of this difficulty, but we confidently believe that good will come out of it for the cause of both religious and civil liberty. A pure Christianity can never make much headway in Europe until there is a re-adjustment or re-organization of the governments there. Hence, all these political changes point to a day, not far distant, when the people will have full liberty to study the

Word of God for themselves. When that day shall come, the reign of despots, in both Church and State, will have ended.

Many signs in our own country indicate a more prosperous condition of the Church. The year that has just passed was marked by great restlessness in religious society. Evidently the old systems are tottering on their rotten foundations. Men are rapidly losing faith in human creeds, and are seeking an interest in Him who is the "same yesterday, to-day, and forever." In other words, the people are more disposed to take Christ as their leader, to trust in him as the "Chief among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely," than ever before. There is, also, a willingness upon the part of the people to take the Word of God as a sufficient rule of faith and practice, and to throw aside all the commandments and traditions of men. These are cheering indications, and should encourage all the friends of truth to renew their efforts in restoring Christianity to its primitive purity and simplicity. Let the year 1869 be full of good fruits in this glorious work.

HOW DOES THE MATTER NOW STAND?—The "Evangelical Ministerial Association of Cincinnati," at its regular meeting in December, adopted a Constitution requiring all ministers in good-standing in their respective denominations to subscribe a specified "doctrinal statement," as a condition of membership in the Association. Pending the motion for adoption of the Constitution, it was asked if said "doctrinal statement" was intended to be a *test*, and if all who refused to subscribe it were to be considered no longer members of the Association. To this it was replied that it was not a test, and that no one was required to subscribe it. The "doctrinal statement" passed, and the Association adjourned. Now, the question is, which is right, the Constitution, which requires that the "statement of doctrines" be subscribed, or the view entertained by a large majority of the Association? As the doings of this Association are likely to become historical, this question ought to be settled. How does the matter stand?

HOW DO YOU LIKE IT?—We send this number of the *Quarterly* to a few of our friends who have not yet subscribed for it, but who, we feel sure, will do so, when they see the kind of Magazine we are publishing. Please send in your names and money at once. Our prospects are very encouraging, and if those who feel the need of such a work will give us their influence, the success of the *Quarterly* will soon be a fixed fact.

WHO WRITES FOR THE QUARTERLY?—It will be seen that the names of the writers in the *Quarterly* do not appear in connection with their respective articles. We prefer that every thing shall stand on its *real* merits, and hence the names will not be given till the last number of the year, when due credit will be made to every one, in the index.